



PROCEEDINGS

PREPARATORY TECHNICAL MEETING

FOR THE JOINT FAO/WHO SECOND INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON NUTRITION (ICN2)

**FAO HEADQUARTERS
ROME, ITALY
NOVEMBER 13-15, 2013**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The joint FAO/WHO Secretariat of the Second International Conference on Nutrition (ICN2) wishes to thank all of those who contributed to the organization of the Preparatory Technical Meeting (PTM) and to the preparation of these Proceedings. First and foremost we would like to acknowledge with gratitude all of the presenters, moderators, speakers and other eminent scholars and world-renowned experts for their expertise and hard work in preparing their papers and presentations as well as for their invaluable cooperation in meeting our various requests.

On FAO's side, we would like to acknowledge with gratitude Mr Jomo Kwame Sundaram, Assistant Director General, Coordinator for Economic and Social Development and Ms Anna Larrey, Director, Nutrition Division, for their support and guidance. We would like to give special thanks to Mr David Hallam, Director, Trade and Markets Division, for his constructive and valuable comments, inputs and suggestions for preparing the meeting and organizing its programme. Our warm thanks are also extended to Ms Janice Meerman, Nutrition Consultant, Nutrition Division, for her assistance in preparing the Proceedings. A special acknowledgment is due to FAO's ICN2 Secretariat, Mr Brian Thompson, ICN2 Coordinator and Ms Leslie Amoroso, ICN2 Programme Officer for their overall supervision, overseeing and coordination in organizing the PTM and preparing the report of the meeting, and special thanks goes to Ms Antonella Alberighi, Clerk, Nutrition Division for her support in checking the submissions and finalizing the report. Tribute is paid to all colleagues in the Nutrition Division who acted as conscientious note takers during the various sessions of the meeting.

On WHO's side we would like to mention: Dr Oleg Chestnov, Assistant Director-General, Noncommunicable Diseases and Mental Health, for his support in the preparation of the meeting; Dr Hans Troedsson, former WHO Executive Director and currently Assistant Director-General, General Management, for skilfully leading the WHO delegation in Rome; Dr Francesco Branca, Director of the Department of Nutrition for Health and Development, Dr Chizuru Nishida, Coordinator, Unit of Nutrition Policy and Scientific Advice, Department of Nutrition for Health and Development, for WHO's technical input.

Finally, both WHO and FAO want to acknowledge the Secretariat team of the UN System Standing Committee on Nutrition, for their substantive technical, administrative and logistics support in the preparation of this meeting.

ACRONYMS

ADS	Agriculture Development Strategy
ALBA	Alianza Bolivariana para los Pueblos de Nuestra América - The Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of Our America)
BMELV	The German Federal Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Consumer Protection
BMG	The German Federal Ministry of Health
BMI	Body Mass Index
BMN	Basic Minimum need Indicators
CAADP	Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme
CELAC	Community of Latin American and Caribbean States
CFS	Committee on World Food Security
CGIAR	Consortium of International Agricultural Research Centers
CNR	Italian National Council of Research
COMESA	Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa
CRA-NUT	Center of Research on Food and Nutrition
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DDS	Diet Diversity Score
DHS	Demographic and Health Survey
ECOSOC	UN Economic and Social Council
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FCS	Food Consumption Score
FIES	Food Insecurity Experience Scale
FSB	Food Balance Sheet
FVC	Food Value Chain
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
HHCE	Household Consumption Expenditure
IAFN	the International Agri-Food Network
ICN2	The Second International Conference on Nutrition
IDS	International Development Studies
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
IFPRI	International Food Policy Research Institute
ISPC/GCIAR	Independent Science & Partnership Council / CGIAR
ISS	Institute of Public Health
JPI	Joint Programming Initiative
LCIRAH	Leverhulme Centre for Integrative Research in Agriculture and Health
LDHS	Lesotho Demographic and Health Survey
LSMS	Living Standards Measurement Survey
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
MIC	Multiple Indicator Consumption Survey

MSNP	Multisectoral Nutrition Plan for Nepal
NAGA	Nepal Nutrition Assessment and Gap Analysis
NAOS	Estrategia para la Nutrición, Actividad Física y Prevención de la Obesidad - Nutrition, Physical Activity and the Prevention of Obesity
NCDs	Noncommunicable Diseases
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NNC	The Philippines National Nutrition Council
OECD	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development
OTP	Outpatients Therapeutic Programme
PAE	Programa de Alimentación Escolar - School Feeding Plan
POU	Prevalence of Undernourishment
PPP	Public Private Partnership
PTM	Preparatory Technical Meeting
R&D	Research & Development
RCT-	Randomized Controlled Trials
REACH	Renewed Efforts Against Child Hunger
SADAC	Southern Africa Development Community
SFFM	Strategic Framework for Food Management
SFP	Supplementary Feeding Programme
SLP	School Lunch Programme
SMP	School Milk Programmes
SPRING	Strengthening Partnerships, Results and Innovations in Nutrition Globally
SUN	Scaling Up Nutrition
TB	Tuberculosis
TIPs	Trials of Improved Practices
UN	United Nations
UN CFS	Un Committee on Food Security
UNASUR	Unión de Naciones Suramericanas - Union of South American Nations
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNSCN	United Nations Standing Committee on Nutrition
USAID	United States Agencies for International Development
WFP	World Food Programme
WHA	World Health Assembly
WHO	World Health Organization
WIC	Women Infant and Children
WTO	World Trade Organization

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	7
Day 1 - Welcome and Introduction	12
Day 1 Session 1 - Nutrition Challenges and Changing Food Systems: Global and National Perspectives	19
PRESENTATION 1 - SITUATION AND TRENDS OF MALNUTRITION	20
PRESENTATION 2 - TRENDS IN FOOD SUPPLY AND IMPACT ON FOOD CONSUMPTION	20
PRESENTATION 3 - DIET MATTERS: APPROACHES AND INDICATORS TO ASSESS AGRICULTURE'S ROLE IN NUTRITION	22
PRESENTATION 4 - POPULATION NUTRIENT AND DIETARY GOALS FOR HEALTH: HOW CAN AGRICULTURE AND THE FOOD SYSTEMS RESPOND?	23
PRESENTATION 5 - AGRICULTURE FOR NUTRITION: GETTING POLICIES RIGHT	24
PRESENTATION 5.1 - NUTRITION POLICIES SINCE 1992	26
PANEL DISCUSSION	27
Day 1 Session 2 - Country experiences in changes in nutritional status and policy environment: What are the lessons learned for implementing nutrition-enhancing policies for food systems, economic development and poverty alleviation?	30
OPENING REMARKS	31
COUNTRY STATEMENTS	31
Day 2 Session 3 - What is meant by nutrition-enhancing agriculture and food systems and what is involved: the linkages between agriculture, food systems and nutrition	59
PRESENTATION – NUTRITION-ENHANCING FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL SYSTEMS	60
PANEL DISCUSSION	61
INTERVENTIONS FROM THE FLOOR	66
PANEL RESPONSE	67
Day 2 Session 4 - What are the policy lessons learned and what are the success factors?	70
PANEL 1: FOOD VALUE CHAINS DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLICATIONS FOR NUTRITION	71
PANELIST PRESENTATION - FOOD VALUE CHAIN TRANSFORMATIONS IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES: NUTRITIONAL IMPLICATIONS	74

PANEL 2: THE INFLUENCE OF AGROFOOD POLICIES AND PROGRAMMES ON THE AVAILABILITY, AFFORDABILITY, SAFETY AND ACCEPTABILITY OF FOOD	79
PANEL RESPONSE	81
COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR, HIGHLIGHTS	86
PANEL RESPONSE	87
PANEL 3: SOCIAL POLICIES AND NUTRITION	88
PANEL RESPONSE	95
PANEL 4: COHERENCE BETWEEN MEETING DIETARY GOALS AND THE FOOD SUPPLY - ECONOMIC IMPLICATIONS OF CHANGING FOOD PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION PATTERNS	96
PANEL RESPONSE	100
DAY 3 SESSION 5 - CONCLUSIONS ON COHERENT POLICIES FOR NUTRITION-ENHANCING AGRICULTURE AND FOOD RELATED SYSTEMS, A SUMMARY OF POLICY ELEMENTS TO BE CONSIDERED BY ICN2, AND PLANNING THE WAY FORWARD FOR THE HIGH-LEVEL EVENT 19-21 NOVEMBER 2014	102
SUMMARY	103
COMMENTS FROM Co- CHAIR DR SUNDARAM	108
COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR, ROUND 1	108
COMMENTS FROM Co-CHAIR DR TROEDSSON	114
COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR, ROUND 2	114
TRANSITION TO THE WAY FORWARD: Co-CHAIR DR TROEDSSON	117
COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR, ROUND 3	117
CLOSING REMARKS: Co- CHAIR DR SUNDARAM	122
CLOSING REMARKS: Co- CHAIR DR TROEDSSON	123
FOLLOW UP AND WAY FORWARD	123
WAY FORWARD	124
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS	125

Executive Summary

INTRODUCTION

The Preparatory Technical Meeting for the Second International Conference on Nutrition (ICN2), jointly convened by FAO and WHO, was held at FAO headquarters, Rome, 13-15 November 2013.

The two and a half day scientific and technical meeting was attended by 128 country delegates from 61 countries, 28 experts and resource persons, 41 representatives from United Nations (including IFPRI, IFAD, UNESCO, UNICEF, World Bank, WFP, WTO) and UN coordinating bodies (UN Standing Committee on Nutrition, High Level Task Force on Food Security and Nutrition), international organizations and other intergovernmental organizations, and 21 representatives from civil society and the private sector.

The meeting was opened by José Graziano da Silva, FAO Director-General with welcoming addresses from Dr Hans Anders Troedsson, Executive Director, WHO, Roberto Ridolfi, Director, EU Commission on Sustainable Growth and Development DEVCO/C, and Jomo Kwame Sundaram, Assistant Director-General, Coordinator for Economic and Social Development.

SESSION 1: CURRENT GLOBAL NUTRITION CHALLENGES, EVOLUTION OF FOOD SYSTEMS, POLICIES AND DIETARY GOALS

Since the last ICN in 1992, every region and most countries have increased average per capita dietary energy supplies by 150-200 kcals per day. However, many hundreds of millions still do not have access to enough dietary energy for basic nourishment. Many more only have monotonous, poor-quality carbohydrate-rich diets resulting in high levels of micronutrient deficiencies. Stunting and micro-nutrient deficiencies are still problems in low income countries and communities.

There has nonetheless been a change in the composition of diets, with increases in the consumption of meat, dairy, fats and oils, sugar, and fruits and vegetables accompanied by less dependence on staples and root crops. In addition, consumption of processed foods has increased in developing countries. Over consumption of foods, often those high in fat and sugar, and unbalanced diets have contributed to obesity and the increase in non-communicable disease. Obesity has also increased in low and middle income countries.

Calls were made to disaggregate data according to income quintiles, to highlight inequalities in nutrition outcomes and to strengthen food and nutrition surveillance systems for more effective policy-making, accountability and advocacy.

Since 1992, a lively nutrition policy debate has developed, but most countries still do not address the multiple burdens of malnutrition throughout the life course, including evidence-informed actions to comprehensively address the underlying basic causes of malnutrition. Implementation is largely inadequate and poorly monitored. There is a need for an appropriate package of policies to deal with the multiple burdens of malnutrition, addressing both supply and demand issues. It is necessary to

reallocate resources to ensure a more diverse portfolio of food crops and to produce more nutrients, rather than just food. It will be necessary to decide what requires public intervention as well as the responsibilities of the private sector and civil society.

SESSION 2: COUNTRY EXPERIENCES ON CHANGES IN NUTRITIONAL STATUS AND POLICY

ENVIRONMENT: WHAT ARE THE LESSONS LEARNED FROM COUNTRIES IN IMPLEMENTING NUTRITION-ENHANCING POLICIES FOR FOOD SYSTEMS, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND POVERTY ALLEVIATION?

Dr Nabarro opened the session by stating its purpose was to review country experiences in changes in nutritional status. He encouraged speakers to focus on three themes: 1) national experiences over the past ten years, especially success stories that could be adapted to other country contexts, 2) in-country or regional policy developments with particularly important implications for nutrition, and 3) public-private partnerships.

Many statements made by low and middle income countries included statistics on progress made in stunting, breastfeeding and other nutrition indicators. Training community based service providers in provision of nutrition advice was cited repeatedly as an important strategy to improve household level nutrition outcomes. Involving traditional local leaders to promote behavior change at the grassroots was also mentioned.

In addition, the vast majority of low and middle income countries who presented reported on the development of mechanisms and tools to improve intersectoral collaboration, including collaboration as mandated via a National Nutrition Policy, often through a National Nutrition Security Committee or similar; and as facilitated through platforms (many SUN-related), advisory groups, networks, etc. In some cases efforts have been made to mainstream nutrition into specific components of Agricultural Development Plans and/or National Development Plans. Involvement of civil society and the food industry were cited as important to assure implementation of nutrition related activities in these plans, as well as for implementation of National Nutrition Policies themselves. The importance of multistakeholder platforms was also emphasized in the context of nutrition transition, especially in regards to creating links between food, nutrition and health to improve food safety and diet quality.

Many low and middle income countries cited financing shortfalls as a critical challenge. Gaps in capacity were also cited repeatedly by these countries, both in terms of capacity across sectors to implement nutrition sensitive interventions, and in terms of staff numbers, namely in regards to low levels of government personnel with nutrition training.

Statements from high income countries with experience in addressing the food system for the prevention of chronic disease also emphasized the importance of collaborating with all stakeholders; for example, by recruiting the food industry and other members of the private sector to be active participants in policy processes from the beginning. Involving these stakeholders from the outset was framed as crucial to assuring buy-in and accountability.

A number of statements from high income countries also described the experience of drafting a Nutrition Action Plan or similar with inputs from multiple line ministries. This approach was cited repeatedly as important to intersectoral collaboration. However in one case it was also acknowledged as falling short, the reason given was that the Plan's implementation had been largely under the purview of

the Ministry of Health; as a result ownership in non-health sectors was weak. Labelling, including “branding” of healthy foods was cited as a current strategy to facilitate educated consumer choices.

In addition to the emphasis placed on multisectoral collaboration by many speakers, other subjects frequently mentioned included:

- The importance of getting development policies right by making social inclusion, equity, women and children explicit considerations.
- Making sure that people are at the centre of the policy formulation process.
- The importance of nutrition education, advocacy and communication through media and established nutrition networks and fora.
- The need for better monitoring and evaluation systems as crucial in the justification for and design of nutrition policies based on scientific evidence and good practices.
- The importance of simultaneous use of many different tools and a mix of approaches to improve diets.
- Cash transfers and school feeding programmes as an important entry point for nutrition-enhancing interventions.
- The need for committed governments to inspire, stimulate and mobilize to accelerate progress on nutrition.
- The recognition that civil society, parliamentarians and other stakeholders are all part of the political process, and that political commitment is essential to scaling up nutrition.
- The need for more sustainable funding mechanisms.

Potential for cooperation on nutrition security via regional bodies was also mentioned by both high and low income countries.

SESSION 3: WHAT IS MEANT BY NUTRITION-ENHANCING AGRICULTURE AND FOOD SYSTEMS AND WHAT IS INVOLVED: THE LINKAGES AMONG AGRICULTURE, FOOD SYSTEMS AND NUTRITION

The session identified three reasons why agriculture is currently not more nutrition-enhancing: there is no nutrition ministry or agency ultimately responsible for nutrition which has jurisdiction over food systems; economic drivers may shape food supply in ways that do not meet nutrition needs; consumer choices may be driven by other concerns, such as convenience, price and palatability, rather than good nutrition. The conclusion was that policies influencing agriculture and food systems have much potential for improving nutrition, but consumer behaviour should be better understood, informed and oriented.

Also addressed in this session:

- Women’s time allocation: evidence shows women’s time constraints to be critical in limiting nutrition-enhancing agriculture and food systems.
- While better use should be made of empirical evidence, randomized control trials (RCTs) may not be appropriate to assess the nutrition impact of agriculture and food-based interventions.
- Getting agriculture and nutrition frontline workers to work together is very challenging.
- The gap between short term emergency responses and longer term development programming needs to be bridged.
- There is a need to include nutrition goals as goals of other sectoral policies, including agriculture and social support.
- Elimination of hunger and poverty are important, but not sufficient to eliminate micronutrient deficiencies.

SESSION 4: WHAT ARE THE POLICY LESSONS LEARNED AND WHAT ARE THE SUCCESS FACTORS

Well-regulated value chains can have positive impacts on nutrition by providing year-round access to micronutrients, improving food safety and facilitating dietary diversity. However, achieving this may involve risks for producers, especially smallholders, including meeting higher product standards, and potentially low consumer demand for nutritious products. The role of governments and civil society in regulating value chains and ensuring private sector accountability were discussed. It will be necessary to decide what requires public interventions and what are the responsibilities of the private sector. Food safety is necessary for good nutrition. Although food safety improves with better quality control, risk also increases with the length of the value chain, and with perishable products such as unprocessed fruits, vegetables and animal source foods.

The panel on social protection concluded that there is little systematic evidence that such programmes effectively address malnutrition. Whether this is due to lack of impact or lack of good data is unclear, likely depending on the scope and intent of the programme in question. While improved nutrition is not always an explicit objective, social protection programmes should be considered as one systematic approach to improve nutrition. Comprehensive, “prophylactic” *ex-ante* social protection policy cannot ignore the issues of food and nutrition security.

Obesity prevention is considered good value for money as it saves lives, is a good investment, and has the ability to reduce health inequalities; efforts to promote healthier diets should be economically sustainable over the medium and long term.

As we cannot just rely on health solutions, providing an enabling environment and incentives for nutritionally desirable investments is crucial.

SESSION 5: CONCLUSIONS ON COHERENT POLICIES FOR NUTRITION-ENHANCING AGRICULTURE AND FOOD RELATED SYSTEMS, A SUMMARY OF POLICY ELEMENTS TO BE CONSIDERED BY ICN2, AND PLANNING THE WAY FORWARD FOR THE HIGH-LEVEL EVENT 19-23 NOVEMBER 2014

Professor Per Pinstrup-Andersen provided a summary of the first two days, highlighting the need to shift discussions from the conceptual level to concrete country cases, and to take urgent action in countries with high levels of under nutrition, despite imperfect information. He suggested the meeting provided five broad recommendations, to:

- provide a common vision for nutrition at all levels while considering context specific factors
- build institutional capacity and promote effective coordination across sectors
- provide better metrics and indicators for better policy making
- improve value chains to benefit nutrition
- align nutrition objectives with agriculture, health and food system goals, focusing on more nutrients, not just more food, and taking sustainability into account, so that human health and ecological health go together.

Country representatives made the following recommendations for planning the way forward for the 2014 high-level event:

1. It is expected that the ICN2 will reach consensus on a global policy framework that addresses current and foreseeable major nutrition challenges. Such a political outcome document (a Declaration or an Accord) will require consensus, mediated through an intergovernmental process, accompanied by a technical document prepared by the Secretariat that provides a framework or plan of action to guide its implementation.
2. As nutrition is, by nature, multi-sectoral, the outcome document should specify ways by which nutrition may be improved through the food system, including agriculture and trade, as well as in health and social protection. ICN2 should build the political will and secure the financial commitment for implementation at country level. The process for preparing these documents should be inclusive and participatory and rolled out according to a roadmap to be prepared by the FAO/WHO Secretariat.
3. FAO and WHO were requested to communicate the outcome of the Preparatory Technical Meeting and the next steps expected to their respective governing bodies at the earliest opportunity. The FAO/WHO Secretariat should also prepare briefings for Permanent Representatives in Rome, Geneva and New York.
4. At the technical level, a consolidated summary of the major nutrition challenges and viable options should be prepared, drawing upon the preparatory work already undertaken.
5. Regional perspectives should be incorporated in the political declaration and technical framework of action for ICN2, taking into consideration the regional consultations conducted as part of the ICN2 preparatory process and the forthcoming 2014 FAO Regional Conferences and WHO Regional Committee meetings.
6. ICN2 should be informed by other international food and nutrition security initiatives including the post-2015 development agenda, the Zero Hunger Challenge, and the SUN movement, and feed into Milan Expo 2015.
7. FAO and WHO should strengthen their cooperation, engagement, commitment and resource mobilization efforts in ICN2 preparations. An effective fund raising exercise is urgently required as part of an effective resource mobilization strategy to support preparations for and organization of ICN2. An effective communications strategy to give greater visibility to ICN2 and its key messages should be developed.
8. FAO and WHO should convene a meeting of the ICN2 Steering Committee to plan and implement next steps towards the ICN2 High-Level Conference, including deciding on its format.

WAY FORWARD:

- FAO and WHO should facilitate establishment of an intergovernmental process led by Member States to develop a brief outcome document for ICN2.
- The intergovernmental process should involve all regional groupings.
- The joint FAO/WHO Secretariat should prepare a zero draft of the document for consideration by the intergovernmental processes.
- Involvement of non-state actors in ICN2 should be considered.

DAY 1

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

DR ANNA LARTEY
DIRECTOR, NUTRITION DIVISION, FAO

Your Excellencies,
Distinguished guests,
Ladies and gentlemen,

The long awaited Preparatory Technical Meeting for the ICN2 is here. Our Director-General will be giving you a befitting welcome, so I will not say very much. Just to say that you are welcome and let's please invite our Director General to give us the appropriate welcome from the house.
Thank you very much.

DR JOSE GRAZIANO DA SILVA
DIRECTOR-GENERAL, FAO

Your Excellencies,
Distinguished guests,
Colleagues,
Ladies and gentlemen,

It is my pleasure to welcome you to this Preparatory Technical Meeting for the Second International Conference on Nutrition that will take place 19-21 November 2014. Let me acknowledge and thank FAO and WHO Members, and all other stakeholders, for their active involvement in the preparatory process. Your active involvement is essential because political commitment is the foundation of any successful effort to promote food security and good nutrition. Our decisions gain strength and legitimacy when different voices participate in the debate and when we work together to overcome differences and coordinate our work.

This meeting reflects both of these points. It brings together high-level technical experts and researchers representing Member States, United Nations agencies, intergovernmental organizations, the private sector and civil society, including non-governmental organizations and consumer associations, and movements such as Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN). It is jointly organized by FAO and WHO, with the involvement of the other UN System bodies and international partners. It is one more example of working together towards a common goal.

Your contributions at this preparatory meeting will help shape the ICN2. And I am sure they will also contribute to the post-2015 development agenda, to meeting the Zero Hunger Challenge, and to the Expo 2015, in Milan, whose theme will be "Feeding the Planet, Energy for Life". Be assured your inputs will also help inform FAO's work on nutrition, an issue which is central to our mandate of raising levels of nutrition and contributing to a food secure and sustainable world.

Ladies and gentlemen,

Guaranteeing adequate food security and nutrition is one of the major challenges we face. It is clear that the ways in which food is managed today are failing to result in sufficient improvements in nutrition. The most shocking fact is that over 840 million people today still suffer from hunger despite the fact that the world produces enough food for all.

But that is only part of the story: today, over half of the world's population is affected by some form of malnutrition, be it hunger and under nutrition, micronutrient deficiency or excessive consumption. At the same time, more than one third of food goes to waste. The total amount of food produced but not consumed would be enough to feed two billion people. The truth of the matter is that consumers are not receiving the right signals from current policies about how to eat healthily. That is what we need to address. For some, over-consumption and waste are too easy because food prices are low relative to incomes. Others are hungry simply because they cannot afford to buy enough food to share with all their family members. ICN2 will provide us the opportunity to chart a better future in which all people are well nourished from food that is produced and consumed through sustainable systems.

We can and need to do better.

It is up to all of you to pool your skills in order to help define the actions that have to be taken now by individuals, countries and the international community to move quickly towards this goal. That is why I invite you to think outside the box over the next days. To take a critical look at current food management policies and processes and propose ways forward. To ask yourselves which of them foster bad nutrition and should be changed; and which of them contribute to good nutrition and need to be supported, strengthened and expanded.

Please be bold in exploring better options. Be creative yet practical in coming up with your recommendations.

Ladies and gentlemen,

International attention on nutrition has its roots in Rome, with the first International Conference on Nutrition being held here in 1992. Nutrition has received continued attention over the years, in Rome and elsewhere. For example, last June, at the Nutrition for Growth meeting in London, the Global Panel on Agriculture and Food Systems for Nutrition was launched.

I also want to recall the proposal for a stand-alone goal for food security and nutrition in the post-2015 development agenda, as recommended by the High Level Consultation on Hunger, Food Security and Nutrition that took place last April in Madrid, supported by the three Rome-based UN agencies. And in 2014, 22 years after the original International Conference on Nutrition, the ICN2 will provide the opportunity to nurture our renewed global effort to ensure that the right to adequate, healthy and nutritious food is a reality for every human being.

Thank you very much for your attention.

DR HANS ANDERS TROEDSSON

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL'S OFFICE, WHO

Diet is one of the most important risk factors for the global burden of disease and challenges of nutrition are multifaceted.

Improving nutrition requires food, health and care. The food system needs to be transformed to make economic development compatible with health and the environment.

There is global commitment to improve diet and nutrition expressed through several WHA resolutions and through the political declaration of the High-level Meeting of the General Assembly on the Prevention and Control of Non-communicable Diseases.

WHO has convened the 2nd ICN together with FAO to develop and strengthen policies in the food system compatible with health and environmental goals.

H.E. ROBERTO RIDOLFI

EU COMMISSION'S DIRECTOR FOR SUSTAINABLE GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT, DEVCO

Undernutrition is an indicator of the worst forms of poverty. 165 million children in the world today suffer from stunting and its lifelong consequences on their personal development. More than 3 million of those children die every year due to inadequate nutrition. The Lancet Journal's most recent published figures estimate that up to 11% of the GDP in Africa and Asia is lost to undernutrition.

Aware of the enormous burden that it poses for millions of individuals and the development of their countries, the Commission has placed the fight against undernutrition high on its development agenda.

Last year Commissioner Piebalgs announced the EU's commitment to support countries in reducing stunting in children under 5 by 7 Million by 2025. By doing this the Commission has taken an unprecedented level of commitment among the donor community and has shown the way for others to pledge for measurable and time-bound targets in stunting reduction. Following this announcement we have worked intensely to develop an EU policy framework addressing undernutrition¹ that was finalised last March and adopted by the Council in May. Achieving this target will mean spending money in different ways-the EU has therefore pledged last June to mobilise €3.5 Billion, between 2014 and 2020, to attain our nutrition objective.

Now, what does it take for the EU and other key players to attain our global targets in stunting reduction? I see three main areas where we can make a difference.

First, we need to maintain a high level political commitment so that all players and notably partner countries are persuaded that the reduction of stunting must be a national development priority. We have come a long way, with an increasing number of donors committing to invest more in nutrition and countries committing to national stunting targets. This has been to a great extent the result of the Scaling-up Nutrition Movement efforts, that we fully support, but much more remains to be done.

¹ The EU Communication "Enhancing Maternal and Child Nutrition in external assistance" adopted by College on March 2013, Council Conclusions on 28th May 2013.

Second, we need to scale up our funding for nutrition. This can be done directly through nutrition specific interventions or by making sectors such as Food Security or Water and Sanitation do more for nutrition.

Finally, we need to expand our knowledge base for nutrition through applied research so that we can identify the most cost-effective pathways to have an impact in nutrition.

In all these three areas, organisations like FAO and WHO² must play key role. The EU sees them as strategic allies at global and country level to support advocacy efforts for nutrition. They are instrumental in building capacity in relevant ministries and mainstreaming nutrition in agricultural, food security and health policies.

We must also look at nutrition with an innovative lens and explore the potential for collaboration through partnerships with the private sector, foundations and other with whom FAO and WHO have a longstanding relationship.

I would like to end by inviting you all to use this preparatory meeting to come up with new solutions, partnerships and initiatives so that, together, we can all make undernutrition a thing of the past.

Thank you.

DR JOMO KWAME SUNDARAM

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR-GENERAL, ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT, FAO

Excellencies,
Distinguished guests,
Dear colleagues, friends,

Let me begin by expressing my appreciation to all of you for coming to join us here at FAO headquarters in Rome to participate in the Second International Conference of Nutrition (ICN2) Preparatory Technical Meeting, jointly organized by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and the World Health Organization (WHO), in cooperation with the World Food Programme (WFP), the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), the World Bank, the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), the Secretary-General's High-Level Task Force on the Global Food Security Crisis, the United Nations Education, Science and Culture Organization (UNESCO), the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) and the World Trade Organization (WTO).

High level ICN2

The ICN2 will be the first high-level intergovernmental conference to address global nutrition problems in the 21st century. It will be a three-day high-level intergovernmental conference to be held at FAO Headquarters in Rome on 19-21 November 2014. We expect ICN2 to propose a flexible policy framework to address major contemporary nutrition challenges and to forge better international cooperation on nutrition in the medium term.

² The ICN2 is organised jointly by FAO and WHO

Why a multilateral intergovernmental conference?

There is an urgent need to address the persistently high levels of malnutrition. Since the first ICN held in 1992, notwithstanding improvements in many countries, overall progress in reducing hunger and malnutrition has been unacceptably slow:

- at least 842 million people suffered chronic undernourishment in terms of dietary energy during 2011-2013
- at least two billion people suffer micronutrient deficiencies
- about 45% of 6.9 million child deaths in 2011 were linked to malnutrition
- 162 million children under five are stunted
- 99 million children under five are underweight
- around half a billion adults are deemed obese and vulnerable to non-communicable diseases

Malnutrition, in all its forms, constitutes an intolerable burden, not only on national health systems, but also on the entire economic, social and cultural fabric of nations. Hence, it is a major impediment to development and the full realization of human potential. Only an intergovernmental conference can provide the mandate and obligations for governments to act decisively to address the problem.

Thus, ICN2 will:

- review progress made since the first ICN in 1992, including country-level achievements in scaling up nutrition through nutrition-enhancing interventions, policies and programmes
- share experiences as well as lessons learned on how to align sectoral policies to improve nutritional outcomes
- address outstanding nutrition challenges, considering opportunities for improving nutrition with changes in the global economy, food systems, science and technology
- ensure nutrition is kept high on the development agenda, mobilize greater political commitment, and promote policy coherence, alignment, coordination and cooperation among food, agriculture, health, social and other sectors
- propose how governments and others can work together more effectively to address the multiple burdens of malnutrition.

ICN2 can thus lead nutrition policy with efforts to:

- reduce the multiple burdens of malnutrition
- develop an appropriate framework for contemporary policy and institutional options and guidelines, to better address current and future challenges
- incorporate nutrition-enhancing food systems into national agricultural and nutrition policies and plans
- make specific recommendations for global bodies to strengthen governance and institutional mechanisms to enhance nutrition outcomes
- mobilize resources to promote more nutrition-enhancing food, including agriculture systems, including the UN Secretary-General's Zero Hunger Challenge
- promote intergovernmental cooperation on nutrition, with new objectives, targets and accountability mechanisms
- ensure greater policy coherence at global, regional, national and sub-national levels, including with other stakeholders, e.g. through the Scaling up Nutrition (SUN) movement, the Global Panel on Agriculture and Food Systems for Nutrition and other such initiatives
- disseminate ICN2 messages and outcomes in various fora, such as the post-2015 development agenda and Expo Milano 2015.

Preparatory Technical Meeting

The purpose of this Preparatory Technical Meeting is to exchange information and ideas on how to best address global nutrition challenges. By sharing our knowledge, this meeting can provide the informed bases for reaching broad consensus on policy and political actions required at next year's high level event. The outcome of this meeting will thus inform the ICN2.

This Meeting is a major step in the inclusive preparatory process that FAO, WHO and our other partners have been facilitating. FAO held an international symposium on food and nutrition security in Rome in 2010 to initiate this process. A series of regional and sub-regional preparatory meetings were subsequently held, country nutrition papers and case studies as well as background papers from experts have been prepared, while a series of online discussions on selected themes were organized. All of these feed into and inform this Meeting and ICN2.

The structure of this meeting is organized with this purpose in mind. The first two days will review the evidence and synthesize current thinking on nutrition trends and challenges to define the scope and priorities for next year's Conference. The final day will focus on how we may identify policies or policy elements for nutrition-enhancing agriculture and food related systems to be considered by ICN2 as well as strengthen the coherence of our policies for improving nutrition. It will also help us in planning the way forward and prepare for the Conference 19-21 November 2014.

This is why your participation here is much appreciated. We have senior level experts from nutrition, agriculture, health, foreign affairs and other relevant ministries and agencies as well as policy-makers, policy advisors, researchers, development experts and other officials from UN agencies, other intergovernmental organizations, academia, civil society and the private sector. All of you are needed to help identify how policy priorities and reforms can improve nutrition through better global, national and local food, health, social protection and related systems.

Thank you for being here. Let us make the most of your presence and participation through fruitful and constructive debates, discussions and deliberations.

DAY 1

SESSION 1

NUTRITION CHALLENGES AND CHANGING FOOD SYSTEMS: GLOBAL AND NATIONAL PERSPECTIVES

Moderator: Patrick Webb

Presenters: Francesco Branca, Bruce Traill, Diego Rose,
Prakash Shetty, David Sahn, Chizuru Nishida,
Carlo Cafiero, Jeff Waage

PRESENTATION 1 - SITUATION AND TRENDS OF MALNUTRITION

Francesco Branca

Director of Nutrition for Health and Development (WHO)

In 1992, malnutrition was defined mainly as undernutrition, and obesity and overweight were thought to occur mainly in westernized countries. Since then, the focus of attention has shifted to what is known as the “multiple burden of malnutrition” where low birth weight, wasting, stunting and micronutrient deficiencies coincide with overweight/obesity and diet-related non-communicable diseases (NCDs). The economic and welfare costs of malnutrition, especially stunting, are well recognized and part of the current narrative.

In regards to trends, undernutrition has not decreased at expected rates in South Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa, and global rates of overweight and obesity have increased. Micronutrient deficiencies are stable in prevalence but absolute numbers have increased due to population growth. The quality of data to monitor malnutrition needs to be improved.

- **Moderator:** This presentation highlights the urgent need to think of nutrition in a way that is not “siloed”. It also highlights the challenges faced by current efforts to develop intersectoral policies and programmes.

PRESENTATION 2 - TRENDS IN FOOD SUPPLY AND IMPACT ON FOOD CONSUMPTION³

Bruce Traill

Department of Food Economics and Marketing, School of Agriculture, Policy and Development, University of Reading

Trends in food supply and consumption since 1992 indicate that every region and most countries have increased average energy supplies by 150-200 kcal, and that there has been a change in the composition of diets with increases in the consumption of meat, dairy, fats and oils, sugar, and fruits and vegetables accompanied by less dependence on staples and root crops. Major drivers of these trends include globalization, urbanization, increased incomes and increased participation of women in the labour force.

For a majority of the population this nutrition transition has been positive with diets in general having improved since the last ICN in 1992, contributing to the fact that we are now living longer and healthier than at any time in human history. However there is a downside. For those who have been bypassed by this development, poor monotonous high carbohydrate diets are common contributing to persistently high levels of undernutrition and micronutrient deficiencies. Stunting and micronutrient deficiencies remain particularly high in low income countries although with the numbers of micronutrient deficiencies remaining around two billion, the prevalence appears to have improved since 1992.

For others, over consumption of foods, often those high in fat and sugar, and unbalanced diets have contributed to global increases in overweight/obesity and in non-communicable disease since 1992.

³ Mazzocchi, M; Shankar, B; Traill, WB; Hallam, D (2013). The importance of Trend and Policy Influences on Global Diets since 1992. Rome: FAO.

Available at: http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/user_upload/agn/pdf/PTM-ICN2_02_Traill_Full_Paper_2013-11-06.pdf

Obesity has also increased in low and middle income countries. The burden is especially great given that healthcare systems in many of these countries are underdeveloped.

The presentation examined what is driving the increased consumption of processed foods which has significantly increased particularly in developing countries namely to answer whether there has been long-term latent consumer demand for fast foods which is now being met due to increased purchasing power or whether the rise is linked to marketing. The following were identified as major factors driving food system change:

1. Rising incomes which stimulate demand and supply of larger quantities of food of better quality.
2. Desire for convenience (often linked to urban life-style).
3. Rapid urbanization, with more people living in cities than rural areas worldwide. City life shapes how people live and shop for foods.
4. Female labour force participation: women are seeking more convenience foods due to increasingly busy schedules.
5. Globalisation through rising foreign direct investment and trade, particularly in processed and fast foods. This has been facilitated by trade and investment liberalisation brought about by the World Trade Organisation, and by technological change in transportation and communication.

Implications of supply chain modernization on food supply systems was discussed, including the growing influence of supermarket chains on consumption in middle and high income countries. This is also true in poorer countries where supermarkets and fast food companies are linked to suppliers. Indicators of modernization of the supply chain were cited, namely tight vertical control, private standards and centralized purchasing. A number of hypotheses were put forward as to why food system changes have led to change in consumption, including:

1. Substitution effects: prices of processed foods are often lower than traditional whole foods.
2. A greater variety of foods are now available, especially dairy, meats and snacks.
3. Food safety standards have improved, leading to more consumer confidence in supermarket foods.
4. Marketing – including targeting of children - encourages a preference for Western foods.

Both positive and negative effects on diets have occurred as a result of food supply trends. Professor Traill concluded with the following policy implications:

1. Trade liberalization has driven changes in the food system and this has led to increased incomes. Further liberalization should be encouraged.
2. The modern food supply provides opportunities to address malnutrition through micronutrient diversification and fortification.
3. Governments should work with the food industry to reformulate products to meet current nutritional guidelines for example reducing sodium, sugar and trans fatty acids.
4. We need to counter the emerging non-communicable disease problem now and cannot wait. Cost effective interventions exist and should be implemented.

➤ **Moderator:** This presentation provides a good complement to the first presentation on the trends in malnutrition. It also demonstrates the need for a good evidence base for policy making. There are many theories about changes in food systems and dietary energy supplies (DES) but there remains a lack of any empirical basis to support the theories.

PRESENTATION 3 - DIET MATTERS: APPROACHES AND INDICATORS TO ASSESS AGRICULTURE'S ROLE IN NUTRITION⁴

Diego Rose

**Nutrition Section, Department of Global Community Health and Behavioral Sciences
Tulane University School of Public Health and Tropical Medicine**

The presentation focused on tools used to measure food security and nutrition at the population, household, and individual levels, and in doing so, unpacked the food side of the common conceptual framework for nutrition. Agriculture can improve nutrition directly through changes in food security and diet (e.g. through nutrition enhancement of production systems), as well as indirectly through increasing household incomes or reducing energy requirements (e.g. through labour-saving interventions). Targeting women is most effective in improving overall household food security and the more equitable distribution of food among household members.

Detailed 'gold standard' dietary measurements (e.g. 24 hour recalls) are complicated and costly. As a result, a number of proxy indicators been developed. The following recommendations were made for improved monitoring and evaluation of the impact of food security and agricultural policies, programmes and interventions on nutrition:

1. Assess outcomes proximal to intervention, such as dietary diversity as opposed to more distal indicators such as stunting, which can give misleading results on the effects of food-based interventions
2. New validation research should integrate several indicators and include information on costs.
3. New research is needed on developing indicators on energy expenditures. Good field methods do not exist for assessing energy expenditure which is central to assessing individual dietary adequacy.
4. Focus more on making 'gold standards' less expensive than on making more low-cost proxies. One option worth exploring is to add a 24-hour recall module to the World Bank's Living Standards Measurement Surveys (LSMS).
5. Develop consensus on a standardized suite of specific indicators and on an overall measurement approach, including a systematic approach to determination of thresholds.
6. Continue to foster a diverse set of indicators for population monitoring. Diverse indicators allow for triangulation and better understanding of changes. These include the Women's Diet Diversity Score (DDS), the Food Consumption Score (FCS), and Food Balance Sheet (FBS) data with calculation of the related Prevalence of Undernourishment (POU) indicator.

⁴ Rose, D; Luckett, B; Mundorf Rathert, A (2013). Diet Matters: Approaches and Indicators to Assess the Role of Agriculture in Nutrition. Rome: FAO.

Available at: http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/user_upload/agn/pdf/PTM-ICN2_03_Rose_Full_Paper_2013-31-12.pdf

PRESENTATION 4 - POPULATION NUTRIENT AND DIETARY GOALS FOR HEALTH: HOW CAN AGRICULTURE AND THE FOOD SYSTEMS RESPOND?

Prakash Shetty

Institute of Human Nutrition, University of Southampton

Professor Shetty provided a summary of the 2003 report *Diet, Nutrition and the Prevention of Chronic Diseases Report of the Joint WHO/FAO Expert Consultation* WHO Technical Report Series (TRS), No. 916, observing that the report's conclusions and recommendations have been to inform national food based dietary guidelines. A review of the changes in the food supply since the 1960s based on FAOSTAT food availability data was provided which were used to indicate both healthy and unhealthy trends as follows:

1. Plant and animal production have increased.
2. Availability of fat has increased and many Multiple Indicator Consumption Surveys (MICs) estimated consumption levels exceed the upper limits for recommended total fat intake. Moreover the ratio of saturated to unsaturated fats is not considered optimal.
3. Globally, there is an increasing trend in meat consumption following a positive linear association with income.
4. Availability and estimated consumption of fruits and vegetables is rising.
5. We are far from the reaching the TRS916 goals for sodium and sugar.

We need to understand geographic and economic development contexts when assessing the impact of agriculture and food system policies on nutrition as policies can have different impacts depending on country contexts involving both tradeoffs and opportunity costs. In less developed countries, the nutritional impact of agriculture policies may be stronger partly because the food supply chain is shorter. In high income countries where the food chain is much longer and disposable incomes much higher than food costs, agriculture policies generally have less of an impact. In conclusion, we need to monitor the distribution of food supplies and nutrition status within countries, not only national averages. Final comments were that:

1. Food availability and diversity and hence consumption are increasing in many parts of the world.
2. National averages do not provide a measure of how different segments of the population are meeting recommended nutrient intakes and dietary guidelines - there is a need for regional/sub-regional data.
3. The length of the food chain from farm gate to plate influences adherence to recommended dietary guidelines – the impact of agriculture *per se* is limited in many contexts.
4. Policies and recommendations need to be context specific.

➤ **Moderator:** There are some positive trends since the 1960s. Monitoring of conditions at population level requires attention to distribution, not just the mean; all too often this point is lost.

PRESENTATION 5 - AGRICULTURE FOR NUTRITION: GETTING POLICIES RIGHT⁵

David Sahn

International Professor of Economics

Division of Nutritional Sciences & Department of Economics

Cornell University

The presentation provided a conceptual discussion of nutrition-agriculture pathways and on how lessons learned over the past 20 years can inform future policies and initiatives.

The objective of a more robust agricultural sector and food system is to raise incomes, ensure market availability of low-cost, diverse, safe and nutritious food, and to enable households and consumers to meet their dietary requirements. Other key elements to improving the nutritional status of the population, include a policy framework and targeted interventions that help ensure nutrient absorption and utilization, and to complement the foods consumed as need be, through fortification and supplementation programmes. These include promoting complementary care practices and public health and curative health measures that reduce infection, promote breastfeeding, and encourage other beneficial behaviours and practices, such as the use of oral rehydration therapy and prevention and treatment of communicable disease. An important element of success in all these areas is understanding, and impacting up household behaviour. This goes beyond consumer behaviour, but includes more complex issues such as intrahousehold allocation of resources and time allocation as well as behaviour and policies in other sectors that affect good health and prevent infection.

Another, often neglected issue in the domain of the relationship between nutrition and the food system is “reverse causality”, that is, the impact of health and nutrition on agricultural productivity and livelihoods. The links back from health and nutrition to productivity are perhaps even more important and certainly less understood and given far less attention than vice-versa.

One relatively recent change, especially over the last 5 years, has been the increased focus on women during child-bearing years and on the first 1,000 days of life. This is now considered a pivotal time for investment in nutrition. And the fact is if one looks at the spectrum of potential interventions for improving nutrition during this crucial period, such as providing clean water, preventing infectious diseases, women’s empowerment, and improved prenatal care, they largely fall outside “food based” or agricultural based intervention programmes. However, it is important to note that many of the populations that lack access to these services are the same people mired in a low productivity agro-economic environment associated with low incomes and a lack of health and education services. As such, unless we get the agricultural sector moving, the prospects for complementary investments in health and nutrition are limited to non-existent. Proactive investment in agriculture is needed to maximize the impact of nutrition and health-oriented interventions.

With that in mind, Dr Sahn presented a framework developed by himself and co-authors Prabhu Pingali and Katie Ricketts for considering policies which link food systems and agriculture to nutritional outcomes. Three non-exclusive classifications were developed - subsistence systems, intensive cereal crops systems and commercial/export systems – each facing different challenges.

⁵ Pingali, P; Ricketts, K; Sahn, D (2013). Agriculture for Nutrition: Getting Policies Right. Rome: FAO. Summary paper available at: <http://www.fao.org/docrep/meeting/029/mi896e.pdf>

The presentation looked first at subsistence agriculture (Sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia), noting these systems did not benefit from the productivity gains, income and food supply growth of the Green Revolution. These systems are characterized by low per capita income, low agricultural productivity and high rates of malnutrition.

The second category - intensive cereal crop systems – is found in much of Asia and Latin America. These systems did experience productivity gains from the Green Revolution, but poverty, malnutrition, and perhaps most notably, poor market linkages persist. The latter results in low dietary and production diversity, and low incomes and returns on labor.

The third category - commercial/export systems – is found primarily in Asia, Latin America, and small pockets of Africa. These systems are characterized by farmers involved in specialized production, largely for the commercial market and increasingly, destined for value chain processing and direct integration into the global food system. Perhaps the most interesting thing about these systems is that, although dramatic increases in productivity have already occurred, there is still tremendous opportunity for growth. These systems are also characterized by a high – and growing – level of inequality, measured in terms of income and nutritional inequality (both undernutrition and increased prevalence of NCDs).

In addition to identifying these three systems, the framework also lays out a set of corresponding productivity and value chain investments required to promote the agricultural transformation and promote economic vitality in rural areas, as well as improve nutritional outcomes. For example, from the subsistence system, in terms of productivity gains, there needs to be a focus on neglected staples and traditional crops. This is particularly the case for those crops cultivated by women, which are often the backbone of these kinds of systems. Also promotion of kitchen gardens and backyard livestock. There are also a set of complementary issues: These systems are characterized by a great deal of insecurity in terms of access to land and property rights. The absence of integration with the formal food system often means that conventional food fortification programmes may not have coverage, making biofortification initiatives important. It is also important to recognize that in order to achieve productivity-enhancing possibilities for these populations, income and food transfers may be paramount. Likewise in terms of value chains, traditional markets have been largely neglected, investments in them have been very small. Post-harvest losses and waste are very high, and as a result there are major issues of food security and food safety, which cannot be addressed by the types of regulatory instruments typically applied in more developed food economies.

In conclusion, for the poorest populations in Africa and South Asia, where health and well being in rural areas lags far behind that of urban areas, and where productivity effects of hunger and malnutrition are most acute (largely because of the physical nature of labour inputs), there is vast scope for improving agriculture through investments in health and nutrition. In the absence of doing so, there is emerging evidence that the human capital that is being called upon to improve agriculture is insufficient, and suffering as a result. This is particularly the case for women, who are highly vulnerable for many reasons, including their employment patterns and in terms of reproductive health, as well as their responsibilities in the home and care of children. Unless we can introduce measures to improve the health of women with complementary measures such as labour saving technologies and strategies for empowerment within agriculture and within the home, prospects for improving both subsistence and transition systems are limited.

➤ **Moderator:** The taxonomy of food production systems in relation to nutrition is very useful.

PRESENTATION 5.1 - NUTRITION POLICIES SINCE 1992

Chizuru Nishida

Nutrition Policy and Scientific Advice Unit

Department of Nutrition for Health and Development (WHO)

The 1992 ICN pledged to eliminate famine and famine-related death, starvation and nutrition deficiencies in emergencies, and iodine and vitamin A deficiencies and substantially reduce undernutrition, especially among the vulnerable, diet related communicable diseases, social and other impediments of optimal breastfeeding, and inadequate sanitation and poor hygiene, including unsafe drinking water. To implement the World Declaration and Plan of Action for Nutrition adopted by ICN, countries developed, strengthened and implemented in national action plans based on the nine strategic actions. WHO has monitored and evaluated country progress in their implementation. Despite substantial efforts made since 1992, and notwithstanding much successes in many countries, unacceptably high levels of malnutrition in its all forms persist. Challenges and lessons learned include:

Regarding policies:

- Most countries have nutrition policies, but they do not:
 - Address challenges of the double burden of malnutrition
 - Address nutrition challenges throughout life course
 - Include evidence-informed actions comprehensively
 - Address underlying and basic causes of malnutrition
 - Food security strategies seldom include nutrition goals or actions.

Regarding coordination:

- Intersectoral coordination mechanisms exist in most countries, but they do not:
 - Address existing challenges comprehensively
 - Anchor in high-level policy making frameworks e.g. PMO

Regarding Implementation:

- Most countries implement some key interventions at national scale, but they do not:
 - Implement a comprehensive set of essential nutrition actions at scale
 - Address maternal nutrition through reaching out to girls and reproductive age women before pregnancy
 - Address adequately risk factors for obesity and diet-related NCDs

Regarding monitoring and evaluation:

- Most countries conduct national surveys, but they do not:
 - Include relevant indicators
 - Disaggregate data sufficiently to address inequities
 - Conduct surveys routinely in a timely manner
 - Use collected data for inform policy formulation.

- **Moderator:** There has been significant efforts being made by Member States and other stakeholders in reducing undernutrition since the 1992 ICN. But progress has been unacceptably slow and policy incoherence has been a challenge in achieving more consolidated and harmonized actions.

PANEL DISCUSSION

Carlo Cafiero

Statistics Division, FAO

Emphasized the need for more attention to be given to statistics in monitoring trends and evaluating impact. Dr Cafiero made his intervention in five points:

1. Nutrition is inherently a characteristic of individual status, the result of a combination of factors (food, health, physical activity, etc.). Monitoring nutrition requires individual level data. With respect to food, we need to go beyond the concept of average diets to analyze determinants and outcomes of nutrition at individual level. Statistics based on averages do not reflect inequalities: we need to develop indicators (of the quality of food, the goodness of a diet, or of the individual nutritional status) and to characterize the distribution of these indicators within a population.
2. While, as a consequence, it is clear that the currently existing evidence base for assessing nutrition must be strengthened, consideration of the cost-effectiveness and timeliness of data collection is needed. Highly demanding detailed food consumption surveys may be informative, if well designed, but are likely to entail prohibitive costs and require a considerable amount of time for data collection, analysis and dissemination of the results. For a monitoring framework that is truly effective as a guide for intervention, we need relevant timely information. Research should be focused on identifying leading indicators of potential malnutrition. The prevalence of stunting, although it is a powerful indicator for advocacy, reveals malnutrition when it has already occurred and can be used to guide prevention only to a limited extent: we need early warning indicators to forewarn that stunting is going to happen.
3. New theoretical approaches to measurement in the social sciences, such as those based in Item-Response Theory, can provide the needed tools to monitor “latent traits” in a cost effective ways. The idea is to infer on the overall extent of an underlying condition that cannot be observed directly through a limited number of easily observable facts. The Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES), promoted and used by FAO’s “Voices of the Hungry” project is such a tool that can be used to measure the severity of food insecurity in a reliable, cost-effective way. Similar approaches could be developed to define and operationalize a concept of nutrition security that may cover the physiological, psychological and economic aspects of gaining access to nutrition.
4. Food insecurity is arguably the condition that more than anything else, may lead to malnutrition. Voices of the Hungry will generate valuable methods and data that can be used to test hypotheses on the causes and consequences of food insecurity on a number of outcomes

including and hunger and other forms of malnutrition. It should be a great opportunity for the nutrition community to build on what is already hypothesized on these relationships and to explore other research questions. For example, several studies have already shown robust associations between food insecurity and overweight/obesity, both in children and in adults. The expectation is that our efforts within the Voices of the Hungry will contribute to advances in food insecurity measurement on a global basis and will play a significant role in the monitoring of the Zero Hunger Challenge, as well as any food security target that may be considered for the post 2015 Development Agenda.

5. To be successful, synergies must be sought in integration of existing surveys and to promote wider collaboration across the many organizations concerned with promoting better nutrition. Different international organizations, local governments, non-governmental organizations and advocacy groups should agree on common standards and easily applicable tools such as the FIES, to be used consistently to monitor food insecurity locally or regionally. All these actors should engage diverse stakeholders in the process and building bridges between people of different backgrounds. This may in fact be where its greatest potential lies to effect change and contribute to guaranteeing the human right to adequate food.

Jeff Waage

**Chair, Leverhulme Centre for Agriculture and
London International Development Centre**

There is a growing convergence around issues from rather different parts of the agriculture, health and nutrition community. At LCIRAH, we held a conference two years ago on agriculture, NCDs, and development. Experts were brought together from around the world, but it is not clear whether any of them would have called themselves experts in “agriculture, NCDs and development”. What we brought together were three communities, those communities are well-represented here as well, namely: an agriculture development community, who has had a traditional focus on rural poverty reduction; a nutrition community, with a traditional focus on undernutrition and little experience in dealing with nutrition through agriculture; and a health community with a traditional focus on NCDs.

Although dialogues between these communities have only been ongoing for a limited amount of time (though Dr Nishida did note that NCDs were on the agenda in 1992), there is now a rapid coming together of different perspectives around agriculture and nutrition. This convergence has been moving very quickly. Two weeks ago, as reported by Dr Graziano, the Global Panel on Agriculture and Food Systems for Nutrition met for the first time. In addition to its decision to focus on nutrition promoting policies across agriculture and food systems, it included a resolution to focus on both undernutrition and NCDs, promoted at the level at which the Panel is comprised, namely heads of international organizations and senior representatives in national government and regional bodies. As such, the message of convergence seems to be reaching the highest levels of activity.

Indeed, things are moving so fast that perhaps there is a risk of leaving two things behind:

The first, as discussed by Dr Cafiero, is evidence. There has been much recent examination of evidence, and a lot of mapping of pathways and conceptual frameworks. Exercises in the latter have revealed major evidence gaps, certainly in the area of effectiveness of technical interventions, but particularly in the area of effectiveness of policy interventions. As such, there is a real need to gather together the

evidence. It is out there, though getting it will require the three afore-mentioned communities to come together. And it is important to note that it takes tremendous courage for actors - academic, government and international – from these communities to come together. This meeting is a real step forward in that direction. Another evidence gap is that so far, we have looked at evidence for what works in addressing undernutrition, and evidence of what works in addressing NCDs, but we have not considered policies that would have an optimal effect on both undernutrition and NCDs.

The other thing that might be left behind is policy makers and the general public. The reason for this is largely because, not only have we been moving very fast in regards to the convergence of these ideas, but these ideas are complicated. For example, the relationship between overnutrition and undernutrition has a biological basis in the life course⁶, it also has a political aspect in regards to the double or triple burden, and it has an economic basis in that the poor can only afford inexpensive foods which are often of poor nutritional quality. But these concepts are not easy to understand, they are a bit counter-intuitive and as such in many cases, it is necessary to dispel myths like “calories constitute nutrition” or “obesity is just a problem for the greedy rich” It requires addressing the complexity of pathways from agriculture to nutrition, as mentioned by Dr Rose, the complexity of the double or triple or quadruple burden, and the central and complex role that women play. There needs to be – and rather rapidly – a way of addressing these complicated concepts in simple terms to policy makers. This is possible, both the UNICEF Conceptual Framework and more recently the “1,000 Day” concept have had a tremendous impact on improving understanding regarding maternal and child health and nutrition. The challenge to our community is to come up with a similar, simplified framework for addressing the important relationship between agriculture, nutrition and health.

- **Moderator:** Panelists have highlighted the need for evidence, reducing costs, and for improved metrics. Also stressed was the tradeoff between the cost of additional information and the cost of not having sufficient evidence to inform policy, especially when far-reaching policy changes which would have wide-spread impact on food systems are being proposed. Changes in food systems, diets and health are complex, and there is a need to understand this complexity in specific countries. Oversimplification can be dangerous. If we continue with silo approaches we will not succeed. Having a food policy or a nutrition policy is an important start but it is not enough. How are those policies being implemented, or not? How are they being funded, or not?

⁶ Dr. Waage refers to the “Thrifty Phenotype”: Undernutrition in utero and early infancy creates a predisposition to overweight; this can lead to increased risk for diabetes and other diet-related, chronic diseases among already vulnerable populations. See, among others, Dulloo et al (2006). *International Journal of Obesity* (30): 23-35.

DAY 1

SESSION 2

**COUNTRY EXPERIENCES IN CHANGES IN
NUTRITIONAL STATUS AND POLICY
ENVIRONMENT:**

**WHAT ARE THE LESSONS LEARNED FOR
IMPLEMENTING NUTRITION-ENHANCING
POLICIES FOR FOOD SYSTEMS, ECONOMIC
DEVELOPMENT AND POVERTY ALLEVIATION?**

OPENING REMARKS

David Nabarro

Moderator

UN Special Representative on Food Security and Nutrition

SUN Movement Coordinator

The Session began with a statement from the Moderator, who first confirmed which countries were to speak. He also confirmed speakers for the CAADP Nutrition Capacity Development Initiative and UNICEF.

Dr Nabarro introduced the session by reiterating the purpose of the Session was to review country experiences in changes in nutritional status. Speakers were encouraged to focus on three themes: 1) national experiences over the past ten years, especially success stories that could be adapted to other country contexts, 2) in country or regional policy developments with particularly important implications for nutrition, and 3) public-private partnerships.

COUNTRY STATEMENTS

MALAWI

Malawi has a Scaling up Nutrition (SUN) Civil Society Organization (CSO) network and has developed a Nutrition Education and Communication Strategy in collaboration with stakeholders. To operationalize the Nutrition Education Strategy, advocacy at the highest level was undertaken. The Department of Nutrition is in the Office of the President, with the President responsible for HIV/AIDs and nutrition. The Office of the President was responsible for the launch of the High Level Committee on Scaling Up Nutrition. The theme of this Committee is “Uniting to end stunting”.

Malawi has set up a number of committees on nutrition including a cabinet committee and a parliamentary committee, as well as a government and development partners committee. Communication materials for government, community leaders, media, medical personnel and others have been harmonized and translated into local languages. A toolkit for orientating parliament and media on nutrition is available and materials to raise awareness at all levels and by various means (banners, billboards, talk shows) have been produced. Media orientation sessions have been established to ensure consistency of messages. To coordinate SUN, Malawi has harmonised nutrition education and communication materials with key messages and established multisector coordination structures at national, district and sub-district levels.

Core teams supporting SUN have been set up at district level and down to community level. The bottom line is behaviour change and we have realized that messages are not enough to change behavior. For this reason, in October 2013 the President established a Committee on Nutrition and Food Security, comprised of chiefs and representatives from academia and civil society. This Committee was established in the recognition that chiefs are listened to most, and that others must work with them to develop and disseminate messages for communities. Other groups are looking at girl child education for female empowerment – most women need to be empowered, and we need to start with young girls. Chiefs are developing laws to ensure girls go to school.

Resource gaps include human capacity at district and village level and integration of effective interventions in nutrition plans. The main question is, how can countries ensure the integration of nutrition, climate change and environmental issues in their national plans?

NEPAL

On behalf of the Government of Nepal, I am honored to participate in this very important preparatory meeting and very pleased to present some of our observations and experiences on the nutrition impact of agriculture and food systems in Nepal. To begin with, I would like to highlight some of the key policy and strategic milestones that the Government of Nepal has embarked on in order to promote and accelerate both nutrition specific and nutrition sensitive interventions in a multi-sector approach. Key strategic documents include:

1. Multi-Sectoral Nutrition Plan for Nepal or MSNP (2013 - 2017)
2. Agriculture Development Strategy or ADS (2013 - 2033) – *yet to be approved*
3. Food and Nutrition Security Plan of Action (2013 - 2022) – *yet to be approved*.

With the launching of the MSNP (2013-2017) last year, there are new windows of opportunity for investments in nutrition from different sectors with agriculture being one of the most important sectors to have impact on nutrition outcomes. Like other sectors, agriculture has also been costed in MSNP with a view to enhance nutrition sensitive interventions.

The Three Year Interim Plan (2013-2015) of the Government of Nepal has also identified nutrition and food security as a priority with specific emphasis on multi-sector approaches to nutrition as well as to the agriculture sector. The Agriculture Development Strategy and Food and Nutrition Security Plan of Action are an integral part of this strategy and are in a stage of finalization and approval. This plan creates tremendous potential for coordination opportunities to integrate, promote and harmonize nutrition sensitive agriculture and food based approaches or systems to nutrition.

We understand that it is too early to assess the impact of these policies on nutrition outcomes for Nepal. The health sector has been playing the lead role for nutrition specific interventions over the years and the importance of nutrition-sensitive interventions have only recently been realized and conceptualized. As a result, with the findings of NAGA Nepal Nutrition Assessment and Gap Analysis (NAGA) (2009), the Government of Nepal introduced the MSNP which engages agriculture, urban development, education, federal affairs and local development, and women, children and social welfare in contributing to nutrition sensitive interventions.

The MSNP's coordination mechanisms and multi-sector platforms are established both at central level through high level steering as well as coordination committees, as well as through regional, district, municipal and village level steering committees to ensure coordination and facilitation for implementation. The National Nutrition and Food Security Secretariat established in the National Planning Commission (NPC) has been playing a facilitation role to align and harmonize both food security and nutrition issues together in coordination with the National Planning Commission, the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Agricultural Development, as well as other relevant sectors and development partners.

These are critical needs emerging for funding, building capacity, coordination, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation in order to achieve and measure the impact of agriculture and food systems

on nutrition in Nepal.

Funding: the NPC is conducting a review of the most feasible/applicable funding modalities. In particular the MSNP, ADS and Food and Nutrition Security Plan of Action are planned to be implemented simultaneously. Support has been requested for the same from Enterprise Development Programmes, with commitment and co-funding from the government as well.

Building capacity: Currently, the capacity of sector ministries for implementing these interventions is not sufficient and therefore monitoring and evaluation and subsequent institutional strengthening at the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Agricultural Development has been proposed. Capacity building of sectors at central and district levels are planned. A technical working group is being formed to develop longer term capacity building strategies on nutrition and food security.

Coordination: the coordination structures proposed at central, regional, district and village levels are to facilitate the smooth implementation of all these plans and other relevant programs (e.g. *Suaahara*, the World Bank's Agriculture and Food Security Project, and Feed the Future projects) to facilitate better planning, monitoring and streamlining. These structures must be effectively utilized and efforts should be made to make them more functional at all levels.

Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E): there is need to strengthen the Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and a technical working group on M&E is being formed by the National Planning Commission.

Sustainability: Continuous advocacy and support is required to sustain the commitment of the Government of Nepal during this transition. The support of development partners, academics and experts need to continue during this period. With strong support from development partners and global initiatives like REACH and SUN, it is expected that commitment will be continued from the government side. The same levels of commitment is also expected from development partners.

NETHERLANDS

The upcoming ICN2 meeting in 2014 is a great opportunity to align the world around nutrition. Both the need to act and the opportunity to serve are to be supported by targeted policies and sustainable practices to reach the underserved consumer. ICN2 can and should bring about agreement and alignment of nutrition agendas. Through the ICN the various essential ingredients can be put together into a tasteful menu of change, i.e. food solutions that are healthy, tasty and respond to consumer needs and wants. What is the input we need? A few thoughts to frame the question.

Food and nutrition insecurity is essentially a problem of poverty. A strategy to counter this insecurity needs to be founded on inclusive economic growth. Getting to ZERO is a target that should be the cross-sector objective in the context of food and nutrition security.

The post-2015 MDG agenda should explicitly refer to food and nutrition security: where nutrition security is seen as an integral part of food security and food security is seen as an integral part of nutrition security; both representing the two sides of the same coin as they are inextricably linked.

The overall goal therefore, individually and collectively, is to ensure the world produces enough safe and good quality food to feed a population of 9 billion by 2050. Farmers are key to feeding the world and smallholder farmers, as entrepreneurs that save, invest and innovate, are the basis for agricultural development that can really tackle poverty, hunger and malnutrition.

To counter malnutrition we need nutrition-sensitive agriculture that provides diverse and healthy diets as well as measures to reduce stunting and actions such as food fortification to address acute malnutrition.

Investing in nutrition makes sense from a social and an economic point of view. Every dollar investment generates a return of investment of up to 30 dollars! Economic development is fundamentally important in the fight against hunger and poverty. Business has a role to play because governments cannot continue to feed people, simply because this is not sustainable. Development of sustainable agriculture and securing access to better nutrition requires the involvement of the private sector. Governments should facilitate the private sector playing its role, through helping support a local environment that is enabling (not blocking) local business development.

Sectors must work together more and where possible and practical, and bundle their respective efforts. Nobody is as smart as all of us! Therefore, public-private partnerships that combine the individual strengths of respective sectors can collectively help build food and nutrition security through market-led investments and growth. The approach of bringing together private companies, knowledge institutions, civil society and governments - what The Netherlands refers to as the “golden quadrant” approach - holds the key to effective and efficient food solutions that allow the underserved consumer to be served. The ICN2 should bring about "real food solutions" that include making practical inroads toward "better access to better food for more people".

How to really achieve a zero hunger objective and what is required individually and collectively from all sectors? What works, or more importantly what doesn't work? The overall focus of the ICN2 should be on securing access to people rather than procedures. Everything we do should result in better access of better nutrition for more people.

The zero hunger objective can be achieved through three key actions: Firstly, we need to connect agriculture, food and nutrition at all levels. Secondly, we need to invest in new ideas and delivery models. Thirdly, we need to align agendas (including a One UN agenda on nutrition), work more together, and work swiftly.

SIERRA LEONE

As one of the countries included in the UNSCN led case studies on the nutrition impact of food and agriculture systems conducted in 2013, we have started working on addressing the following recommendations from the report:

- Nutrition sensitive agriculture strategies, approaches and activities being implemented by government partners need to be articulated in policy documents.
- All relevant sectors should include nutrition objectives as part of their policy/strategy/programmes.
- Add indicators to monitor and evaluate nutrition sensitive agriculture.
- Develop and promote dietary guidelines for various groups on what available foods to consume.
- Increase nutrient density of staple foods through community-based fortification of rice and cassava as part of value addition.
- Review agricultural policies to include nutrition sensitive strategies.
- Institute agricultural and food policies that prevent overweight, obesity and non-communicable disease.

Actions taken to address some of the recommendations include:

- Initiated dialogue to develop national food-based dietary guidelines (FBDG) and nutrition education and communication strategy.
- FBDG to be used as a formative and educational tool to promote better diets and address specific problems such as micronutrient deficiencies and non-communicable disease.
- Nutrition indicators mainstreamed in the Small Holder Commercialization Programme of the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security.
- Active engagement of CSOs working at district level to promote viable models and interventions on coordination between sectors and actors working on food and nutrition security.
- Funding from Irish Aid strengthening the capacity of Government and its partners in the design and management of an effective and reliable national and sub-national early warning system for food and nutrition security.

Progress made so far in the effort to actively scale up nutrition interventions:

- Hired nutritionist in the Ministry of Agriculture.
- ADB Support – trained 20 Nutritionist to graduate level with 1 nutritionist in every district.
- Revised nutrition component in the Allied Health Sciences syllabus to incorporate nutrition and food security.
- Nutrition budget line in the ministry of agriculture and health approved.
- SUN secretariat is fully functional with appropriate staff.
- Stakeholders' workshop on the way partners should work within the SUN movement.
- SUN launch at sub-national level 25th November 2013.
- SUN CSO platform formed.
- Food and Nutrition security early warning system deployed in 5 pilot districts (nutrition and food security are one of 10 modules).
- To improve infant and young child feeding practices 2,329 Mother Support Groups in 149 chiefdoms in the country established.
- Outpatients Therapeutic Programme (OTP) sites scaled up from 20 in 2007 to 423 today.
- Supplementary Feeding Programme (SFP) scaled up from 385 in 2008 to 543 today.
- First micronutrient survey underway to help track trend in micronutrient deficiencies.
- Exclusive breastfeeding rate increased from 11% in 2003 to 31% in 2010.

We would like to see the Ministers of relevant ministries (Finance, Health, Agriculture, Education, etc.), senior technical level personnel, CSOs and members of the communities at the ICN2 meeting next year to drive home the importance of multi-sectoral approaches in combating hunger and malnutrition.

THAILAND

More than forty years ago, Thailand experienced a high prevalence of undernutrition (weight-for-age) in under 5 year old children at more than 50%, anaemia in pregnant mothers was 60%, and goitre rate was more than 30%. During the first three National Economic Development Plans from 1962-1976, high levels of malnutrition persisted. In recognition of this, the fourth development plan and subsequent plans from 1977, have included a “social” component, and food and nutrition challenges have been a part of the national plan.

In 1982, a Poverty Alleviation Plan provided a multisectoral forum for integrated approaches to deliver basic minimum services at community level covering the whole country with maximum people participation through volunteer system (one volunteer per 10 households), with nutrition goals and

indicators a part of basic minimum need indicators (BMN). Remedial actions were taken by mutual efforts of service providers and communities with assistance of volunteers leading to a significant reduction of malnutrition in a few years. Actions included promotion of agriculture and food systems to stimulate the subsistence economy, provision of healthy snacks as supplementary food for pregnant mothers, and community-based complementary foods for infant and young children. Surplus food was processed and sold in local markets.

Since 1992 school lunch and school milk programmes (SLP and SMP) have been started from kindergartens with a gradual increase in coverage to 6th grade students. SMP creates a win-win situation as both dairy farmers and industries can benefit from increased milk production and children receive milk as a source of protein, energy, calcium, vitamin B2 and other micronutrients for improved growth. As a consequence, the current level of underweight in children under 5 years of age in 2009 was only 4.8% and 6.3% for stunting. However, overweight and obesity in the country is now up to 8.5%.

The current main forum to deal with food and nutrition challenges is the multistakeholder National Food Committee chaired by the Prime Minister which has developed the Strategic Framework for Food Management (SFFM). There are three main implementation committees to facilitate 1) food security throughout food chain; 2) food quality and safety; and 3) linkages of food, nutrition and health. Numerous innovative and creative approaches have been facilitated and coordinated by twenty subcommittees and task forces. The roles of agriculture and food systems is geared towards production and supplies of healthy diets such as whole grain rice and rice products, legumes, fish, vegetables and fruits, food products with low salt, sugar and fat. Food, nutrition and dietary education will be promoted and supported by multimedia at multiple levels. Community-based approaches will be key for mutual actions of service providers and communities for prevention and control of the rising trend to overweight and obesity, and non-communicable chronic diseases (NCDs). The overall objectives of the SFFM are food and nutrition security, and well being of all citizens in the country with prosperity.

ZIMBABWE

In 1992 despite serious drought, Zimbabwe committed itself to achieving food and nutrition security taking a multi-sector approach. Policies formulated during that period were directed to improve cereal production, and to reduce underweight and stunting through supplemental and school feeding programmes. However during this period we saw child underweight rising from 10% to 13% and stunting levels going up to 33%. Research from various government programmes revealed this deterioration in nutrition outcomes and the need for a complementary approach. Lessons learned from this period include awareness of a disconnection between commitments and specific interventions. Agriculture policies did not help achieve a balanced diet, or nutrition security.

Overproduction of cereals resulted because policies focused on increased cereal production. As a result the government recognized the need to come up with a comprehensive policy that addressed food insecurity and nutrition. The Food and Nutrition Security Policy commits the government to serving areas which are led by different ministries. It promotes policy cohesion and multisectoral collaboration, including adding 10 nutrition sensitive objectives to the agriculture mandate. It also looks at social protection, which is essential to protecting the vulnerable and improving their livelihoods.

This experience resulted in high political commitment to addressing food and nutrition security. The Government of Zimbabwe has now established a Committee on Food and Nutrition Security to ensure that these issues remain on the national agenda and high level follow up to global commitment to

implementation at country level. Hence the establishment of a Food and Nutrition Council under the Office of the President to give its mandate and power to other sectors to ensure implementation. The government is also engaging with the UN on nutrition under the UN government framework. Zimbabwe is also a member of the SUN framework to ensure our efforts are multisectoral and will result in improved food and nutrition security for the country. There is also a Food and Nutrition advisory group linking industry, government officers, development partners, and decision makers in policy direction and formulation.

The five year development direction for this government has four clusters with food and nutrition security Cluster 1. This is a reflection of how the government is committed to addressing food and nutrition security. The Food and Nutrition cluster also calls for strong collaboration, strategic linkages and most importantly, the need for government to significantly financial support for food and nutrition interventions.

In summary, the policies that have been put in place include the Food and Nutrition Security Policy at country level and at regional level CAADP, COMESA, and SADAC policies. Coordination is enhanced by working through the SUN framework and the Food and Nutrition Security Council. Implementation from national down to the lowest level, is defined by the Food and Nutrition Security Policy which includes a well-documented and large implementation matrix launched by the President. The Government has developed a monitoring framework to monitor different interventions and responses across sectors to ensure sustainable food and nutrition security.

FRANCE

We give great importance to nutrition at both national and international levels. Nationally our experience is in coordinated policies implemented since 2001 under a Health and Nutrition Programme, the goal of which is to improve health standards of French people, especially in regards to reducing the risks associated with chronic disease.

All policies to improve health and nutrition are approached using an intersectoral framework through actions of our Ministries for Research, Health and Economics. The Programme aims at reducing health inequalities while giving priority to childhood and youth. The focus is on food security, health security, education, information, quality of products, and food supply and distribution circuits. We also aim to offer diversified agricultural products with the best possible health quality. These activities aim to be very effective in reducing prevalence of overweight and obesity in children. We also stress the consumption of fruits for adults. However we still need to improve our programmes, especially in regards to inequality. In general terms, France considers that know-how in the area of nutrition needs to be further developed in regards to the structure of food systems, demand, and analysis of undernourishment where the overall goal is to identify more sustainable food systems that are respectful of dietary habits.

France is also involved in international action. It has a 2011 Nutrition Strategy for Developing Countries that takes a multisectoral approach with a focus on malnutrition and mother and child health. At the operational level, the focus in 2012-2013 has been on improving food security in sub-Saharan Africa. France is also involved in the recent G8 and other international nutrition initiatives.

VENEZUELA

We are thankful for the work undertaken by FAO and WHO for the preparation and organization of the Preparatory Technical Meeting. For the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, it is very important to share our remarkable results in the field of food security and nutrition, achieved with social policies initiated by the Supreme Commander, Hugo Rafael Chavez Frías.

Last June, the President of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Nicolás Maduro Moros, received from FAO a reward recognizing Venezuela's achievement in meeting before 2015 the first Millennium Developmental Goal and the objective of the World Food Summit.

In 2008, we presented the 5th Plan of Action Follow-up Report of the World Food Summit, in which we described the policies and programs that guarantee food security and nutrition. One of the main actions was the creation in 2004 of the Ministry of the People's Power for Food. This entity is in charge of coordinating food supply and logistics. This effort has allowed 94.7% of 28.5 million people – corresponding to the Venezuelan population – to eat three or more meals in a day. According to the National Institute of Nutrition, caloric availability in Venezuela increased in the last 10 years up to 49.6%, reaching 3182 kilocalories per day.

At the beginning of the Bolivarian Government, the Index for Undernourishment Prevalence was 21%, that is to say, approximately over 5 million people. After 14 years of the President Commander Hugo Chavez Government, this indicator is at 6% or 1.5 million people, the lowest rate in the history of the country. In the 1980's, for every 100 Venezuelans, 22.8% were stunted. Today, this figure barely reaches 1.7%, that is to say, for every 100 Venezuelans, 2 – only 2 – are below their size, this reflects a reduction of 92%.

These important achievements are the result of a legal framework with policies covering production, availability and access to food as well as environmental protection. That is, fundamental pillars of the concept of food security and sovereignty, as laid out by Article 305 of the Constitution of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, as well as in the Organic Law for Food Security and Sovereignty.

This legal framework allowed the creation from 2002 of so-called "Social Missions", these have served as an innovative tool that has strengthened the bond between State and Society in order to face the most urgent needs of the population. The MERCAL (Food Market) Mission has a strong impact among these Social Missions. It is in charge of providing access to food to the most vulnerable sectors of the population.

MERCAL comprises an extensive network of 22,000 supply points, including large and small popular markets throughout the whole country. This network serves 17.5 million people with coverage of over 60% of the Venezuelan population. MERCAL provides a subsidy that reaches up to 80% of the total food price in some products. Additionally, it allows over 4.5 million children to eat at school for free, thanks to the School Feeding Plan - PAE (acronym in Spanish) and approximately 185,000 low-income families to eat three times a day, also at no cost, thanks to the Food Centers.

We have reached the lowest levels of undernourishment in the country's history thanks to the joint effort of the Social Missions, and *inter alia*, the Ministries of Agriculture and Food. Nevertheless, we believe that despite these achievements, there is still much to be done.

The National Nutrition Institute, established in 1949, is still working to create a new and healthy nutritional awareness. As part of the campaign Eat Well to Live Well, it has developed initiatives such as:

- the Comprehensive Programme Nutritional Venezuela
- *Nutripoints*
- the Venezuelan School of Food and Nutrition
- the Food Spinning-top
- Socialist Dietary Centers (Dining rooms), and
- the Wheat Replacement Program: the development of the sovereign breads made from corn, rice, beans, cassava, in order to reduce the imports of wheat in the country.

Regarding the issue of food and nutrition, the National Plan and the Second National Socialist Plan 2013-2019, establish the strengthening of policies for initiatives including:

- ensuring a healthy, safe and sovereign diet
- encouraging breastfeeding
- education to adjust eating habits and fight against overweight and obesity
- developing technology in the Venezuelan food system.

At the international level, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela has launched concrete proposals related to nutrition. These include a proposal for the creation of a regional agricultural input bank to allow small and medium producers to reduce costs, and the proposal for creation of a research and technological innovation Institutes Network to place science and technology at the service of small scale producers. These approaches are part of Venezuela's contribution to the consolidation of strategies against hunger in the context of CELAC, UNASUR, Petrocaribe, the Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of Our America (ALBA) and the Latin America and the Caribbean without Hunger 2025 Initiative.

We believe that malnutrition is a complex and multi-factorial problem. To ensure adequate nutrition globally requires great efforts by many Governments and a lot of political will. We hope that our experience and lessons learned will serve as a contribution to the search for new approaches and policies in this subject.

FINLAND

Finland has witnessed much success in improving nutrition in the recent past. Diet has improved over the last 30 years with decreases in the consumption of salt, sugar, and saturated fat. There is also less socio-economic inequality, and the population is healthier. Finland is happy with these achievements. However, in the last 3 to 4 years, the trends are not so healthy due to the increasing globalisation of trade and marketing. The diet of Finish people has become more salty and includes more saturated fatty acids than 10 years ago. In addition to the globalization of diets, the sustainability issue needs to be taken into account. Four important aspects should be considered to improve diet at the national level:

1. Political commitment and cooperation: It is crucial to act more globally, that is to have all stakeholders on board and have them committed to health goals, including the private sector, catering etc. "We have to act together, no body owns nutrition".
2. Need of evidence-based decision making: there is a need for science and data (monitoring and evaluation), that is, a system that supports decisions. There is a need to know what is happening in the population to be able to take the appropriate decisions and impact actions.

3. Have a universal approach to nutrition: approaches that target the whole population are needed.
4. Influencing structures and use of different policy tools: The implementation of long-term strategies, such as incorporation of nutrition in the school system (including school meals), in the health system (including maternal and child health) and capacity building. There is a need to use all available tools: labelling to inform consumers, taxes on unhealthy foods, subsidies for healthy foods, reformulation of products, marketing to children. There is a need to influence what is produced in the country, e.g. increase oil production instead of butter, reduce the quantity and change the quality of fat in meat. We need to use different tools and a mix of approaches to improve the diet.

Finally, there is a need to emphasize action and cooperation at the global level. National and regional actions are not enough; we need to think globally to make sure we have a planet with healthy people.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Our principle is that we are all in the same boat, there are not small countries or large countries, we are the same and we all need to work together for our common future. In the U.S. there is strong presidential and congressional support at domestic and global level. At the domestic level, as in many other countries, we have inequity and vulnerable populations. Many programmes exist to help poor people access good nutrition including cash transfer programmes and supplementary nutritional assistance, and for many years we have had the Women Infant and Children (WIC) programme. We are also facing the double burden of malnutrition. With “Let’s Move”, our First Lady supports teaching children about the importance of good nutrition and physical activity. Last week, the Food and Drug Administration banned trans fats, this is part of the government’s work with private industry to attempt to improve the quality of processed foods.

The U.S. hopes to support the efforts of the world and we are preparing a multidisciplinary strategy to do so. In this regard, the “Feed the Future Strategy”, launched by President Barack Obama together with the Global Health Initiative, aims to improve food production around the world, especially in those countries that are working directly with the U.S. We are also a supporter of the “1000 days Partnership”, which calls for maximum attention to be paid to children from conception through the first 2 years of life. It is important to realize that half of the success of the 1000 days initiative depends on the health and nutrition of the mother; as such the importance of nutrition for women must also be underscored.

The U.S. is part of the global nutrition community working through the SUN, Nutrition for Growth initiative and others. We will keep doing this. Our international work principles are universal but solutions are local. In this context, all of our interventions should be country led and country owned. It is easy to say this but difficult to apply. Bear with us as we are learning how to work in this way. We are trying to apply the Accra and Paris Declaration principles for global development.

Convergence of international and global movements should be in support of national plans, not vice versa. This may not be happening, but countries should really have a strong voice for them to direct their own development.

Along these lines, we also consider the private sector to have an important role to play in order to have sufficient food for the increasing global population. Food technology will improve safety, half life and

nutritional content of foods. Food technology is going to improve bioavailability of micronutrients. Food industry should be seen as an ally, not an enemy, of food security efforts.

We would like to see the ICN2 focus attention on gender development, considering women's roles, not only in terms of food production, but also as caregivers of children. There should be an emphasis on how to close gaps in social inequalities, especially for poor smallholder farmers and low income urban populations. We need to recognize that it is not only a matter of producing food but also of raising income.

Linked to this is the need for evidence data. It is not possible to work solely based on ideological principles; we need to work with everyone to reach food security for all. The double burden of malnutrition also needs to be faced together. Finally we should say "food security and nutrition" and not "food and nutrition security". This simple change is very important. Nutrition is important by itself, and should have accountability by itself. Nutrition specific interventions should not be temporary but permanent (long-term). We need to accept and do that.

BRAZIL

We have a National Policy for Nutrition and a National Policy for Food Security. The first one is linked to the Ministry of Health and the second with the Ministry of Social Development. Both ministries work together with the Ministry of Education in public policies with a national impact. In less than 10 years poverty has reduced in Brazil as measured by the decrease from 32 million to 13 million hungry people. For this we have to thank the *Bolsa Familia* programme or "Family Scholarship: a cash transfer program which has reduced poverty.

We also must thank the National School Feeding Programme, coordinated with the Ministry of Education, which serves 42,000,000 children. This programme is linked to the National Policy for Food Security and the National Policy for Nutrition. Through this programme, money is transferred to states and municipalities for public schools to purchase and serve meals at schools. These meals are prepared by trained specialists and the food is purchased according to menus prepared by nutritionists. All states have to follow these menus. The school feeding program is socially controlled by councils, which oversee the allocation of public money to each municipality and each state. Brazil believes school feeding links the present – fighting against immediate hunger - and the future - school for education. Children are fed with adequate food.

Brazil also has shares the afore-mentioned vision that good food prevents health problems. We are cooperating with more than 40 countries in Latin America, Africa and Asia sharing our experiences on our National School Feeding Programme and our multi-sector National Policies for Nutrition and Food Security.

PHILIPPINES

The Philippines is one of the middle-income countries of Southeast Asia. It is part of the Pacific Ring of Fire characterized by active volcanoes with a tropical climate dominated by a wet and dry season. All of its 7,100 islands are prone to typhoons, earthquakes and other natural disasters. Its population growth rate has slowed to about 1.9 for the period 2000-2010, lower than the 2.34 recorded for the previous decade. It has experienced 5-6% economic growth in recent years based on measures of gross domestic product and gross national income.

However, the Philippines continues to grapple with hunger and malnutrition as about 66.9% of

households continue to consume less than the energy requirement. Furthermore, child (0-60 months old) malnutrition, particularly underweight-for-age and stunting, continues to be a concern, notwithstanding observed reductions from 34.7% in 1990 to 20.2% in 2011. Wasting has likewise continued to hover around the 5-7% level. Overweight and obesity is a growing problem, especially among adults 20 years and over.

The post-ICN Agriculture and Fisheries Modernization Act of 1997 aimed to transform both sectors to be more technology-based to gain competitiveness, while ensuring equal access to resources by communities. The rice self-sufficiency program started in 2011 as part of a national program of self-sufficiency on food staples is a means to increase rural incomes and ensure sustainable food security and reduce poverty across the country. This year has been declared the national year of rice to promote responsible rice consumption for better health and reduce rice wastage.

Malnutrition is caused by a host of factors related to each other. The Philippines is pursuing actions to address all determinants at various levels, through the National Nutrition Council (NNC) created by law and shared by the Departments of Health, Agriculture, Interior and Local Government, Education, Social Welfare, Trade and Industry, Labor and Employment, Science and Technology, Budget and Management, National Economic and Development Authority, and the private sector. The NNC secretariat implements the decisions of the governing board and provides technical services. The secretariat has its own structure and annual budget appropriations for its operations. The local government units have also provided a mechanism for management of nutrition programs at the local level.

The Philippines Plan of Action for Nutrition developed following the ICN, sets nutrition goals for the overall national development plan. Currently, the plan focuses on the first 1000 days of life and aims at reducing underweight and stunting. It includes actions to address the various determinants of malnutrition. The Philippines has mandatory salt iodization, mandatory fortification of staples, and regulation of marketing of breast milk substitutes as well as promotion of breastfeeding and complementary feeding.

A key challenge is to find an appropriate mix of interventions to reduce stunting. This calls for strengthening of promotion of complementary feeding (based on the FAO Trials of Improved Practices (TIPs) methodology), strengthening the nutrition perspective in the development of policies and programs, selecting appropriate indicators to select priorities in normal and emergency situations, integration of nutrition education, and capacity building for policy formulation as well as nutrition program management of local government units. The country emphasizes human rights perspective, participation of all stakeholders and a multisectoral approach that views nutrition as both an input and output of development.

GERMANY

“IN FORM” is Germany's National Action Plan for the prevention of malnutrition, lack of physical activity, overweight and related diseases. Many Germans are overweight and they don't move enough:

- One out of five Germans has a Body Mass Index of over 30.
- Half of all women and 67% of men in Germany are overweight.
- Children and older people are increasingly affected by malnutrition.

The former Federal Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Consumer Protection (BMELV) and the Federal Ministry of Health (BMG) decided to develop an action plan and to join forces with the 16 German

Laender governments, municipalities, and with civil society. In 2008, the German Federal Cabinet adopted IN FORM which has the following aims:

- Adults should adopt healthier lifestyles.
- Children should grow up healthier and in healthier environments.
- The population in general should enjoy a higher quality of life and be physically fitter.

IN FORM is a long-term action plan that runs until 2020 in order to achieve that non-communicable diseases and related costs for the health care system will be significantly reduced. IN FORM counts on people's motivation and personal initiative and encourages women, men and children to adopt healthier lifestyles by using 5 strategies:

1. Target group-oriented communication.
2. Practical approaches.
3. Sustainable institutional structures.
4. Networks that interconnect actors and projects.
5. Public relations work.

Examples of successful approaches:

1. The Young Family Network - Young families in Germany face countless sources of information which often contradict each other and cause confusion. The Young Family Network is a network of paediatricians, midwives and gynaecologists who speak with one voice. The Network publishes scientifically valid messages. These messages are communicated to families by trained experts, via the new media and printed publications. Both the experts and the target groups have given very positive feedback.
2. Networking Units for improving food provided at schools and day care centres - due to inadequate food availability at day care centres and schools, a small model project was started in Berlin. Its aim was to improve the food offered in day care centres and schools. This quickly gained attention all over Germany and, like Berlin, other Laender governments wanted to improve things, too. Today, there are 16 Networking Units across the country, namely one in each federal state. They exchange work experiences and continuously improve food offered in day care centres and schools. The Networking Units are funded by both the state government and the individual Laender governments.

IN FORM is based on a comprehensive long-term government strategy, lead jointly by two Federal Ministries. All relevant experts, actors and institutions that are involved in education on food and nutrition and in promoting physical activity, were contacted and participated actively in the IN FORM planning and implementing processes from the start. This was the only way to gather wide support, irrespective of political orientations, opinions or approaches. And this is, from Germany's perspective, is the only way to make an action plan succeed.

SRI LANKA

Sri Lanka has executed a number of interventions recently in nutrition. The Nutrition Secretariat under the patronage of his Excellency the President Mahinda Rajapaksa was established, with increased deliberations regarding a multisectoral approach with the Ministries of Agriculture, Health, Education, Local Government and Economic Development being stakeholders. A plan has been finalized and is pending Cabinet approval, following which, legislation will take place.

Regarding the multisectoral side, in terms of agriculture from 2005 the government has focused on increasing productivity. There is a fertilizer subsidy in place which has led to self sufficiency in rice, maize and a few pulses. Excess production is diverted to supplemental feeding programmes. Currently these programmes are working with aid agencies to develop a model for how to use the excess production.

A comprehensive social mobilization programme following the war has been implemented. Named “Enhancing Livelihoods” in Sinhala, the prime focus is on community and household level industries. For example, there has been distribution of chicks and plant material. Close to 2 million households have benefitted. As a result of this programme, home gardening and other concepts have been introduced to ensure household economic security, and at the same time, nutritional security.

Also as a result of this programme, identified schools have - on a pilot basis - been given a Meals Programme, with some of the afore-mentioned excess production, especially in terms of eggs and chickens, being diverted to these schools. In the dairy sector within the last two years the self sufficiency of milk, which was standing at 16% two years ago, has been increased to 33%. Multinationals and private sector industries who had in the past ignored this sector are now induced to help local dairy farmers, and to particularly focus on schools.

The principle the government is following is that nutritional and economic policies implemented by government must be complemented by the private sector and multinationals. This is very visible in the dairy sector where all the multinationals and local private sector stakeholders have provided some input to ensure that farmers and schools benefit from increased production.

SPAIN

In 2005, the NAOS Strategy (Strategy for Nutrition, Physical Activity and the Prevention of Obesity) was set up by the Ministry of Health and Consumer Affairs with the aim of making the population more aware of the problem of obesity, especially on its impact on health. NAOS promotes initiatives to encourage citizens, particularly children and young people, to adopt healthy lifestyles, improve dietary habits and increase regular physical activity. NAOS aims to serve as a platform for any actions which help to meet this objective, by joining forces with, and with the widest possible participation of, all components of society, including public administrations, experts in the field, private sector businesses, consumers and households. The scope and areas of action and influence of NAOS are multiple: families, schools, the business world and the health system. Some of the complementary activities to the NAOS Strategy are the publicity and marketing-oriented PAOS Code, which is a Code of Self-Regulation with economic operators to regulate the advertising of food and drink aimed at young people under the age of 12, in order to prevent obesity and encourage healthy habits. Also there is the Observatory of Nutrition and of the Study of Obesity that regularly quantifies and analyses the prevalence of obesity in the Spanish population and measures the progress obtained in the prevention of this disease.

Lessons learned by Spain since 2005 include:

- the need for a multisectoral approach
- the critical need to be aligned with official policies and strategies endorsed by international bodies (i.e. WHO, FAO, EU)
- the importance of supporting specific policies and specific interventions that promote good dietary habits and healthy lifestyles
- the importance of well informed and educated consumers on nutrition and physical activity,

- the importance of promoting actions in various settings: schools, homes, communities, health centres etc.
- the importance of promoting a healthy food environment, especially for children
- the importance of entering into agreements with the beverage and food industry for the reformulation of products and the regulation of marketing of products to children
- the need to place more emphasis on prevention versus treatment, and
- the need to improve interventions and information campaigns.

Spain has recently started up a new strategy to reduce food waste; we believe this is especially important in the context of the economic crisis. We are working together with food banks to improve efficiency in the distribution of food.

INDIA

India is home to one-sixth of the global population. We have been self sufficient in food grain production since the 1960's and have invested in large-scale food supplementation programmes covering preschool children, school children, as well as pregnant and lactating women for almost forty years. Despite this, undernutrition continues to be a major problem. Our country has invested in building up systems, agriculture, demography, and health and nutrition for defining the magnitude of the problems in these sectors and programme monitoring is also fairly strong. The government has been trying to use the evidence produced by these databases to build up rational, feasible intervention programmes.

But we have huge problems in trying to implement these programmes across a vast and varied country like India. We all know that adequate food production is the essential prerequisite for food and nutrition security. India accepted that nutrition-sensitive agriculture is a win-win situation both for the small and marginal farmer who can benefit from diversification of agriculture, growing pulses and vegetables and for the population which should receive more than just food grains given in large quantities.

India has had a National Food Security Mission to take care of the problem of providing the food grains needed for the growing population and maintaining self sufficiency in food grain production. We have been fairly successful in this, and the current predictions are that, even in 2030 when India will become the most populous country in the world, we will be self sufficient in food grain production.

Pulses are the major sources of protein in Indian diets. The Food Security Mission has invested heavily in increasing pulse production within the country. They have been successful in the last three years, and it is hoped that by 2017, India will be self sufficient in pulse production.

We have a national Horticultural Mission set up in 2003, which has been focusing on making horticulture a profitable venture for small land holders as well as ensuring small farmers focus their production on micronutrient-rich, relatively inexpensive, regionally acceptable vegetables which can be marketed widely. We hope that increasing consumption of vegetables, which is now obvious in urban areas, will soon become obvious in rural areas. This, when coupled with most of the population's increased access to iron and iodine fortified salt, could dramatically increase iron intake, thereby reducing anaemia which is a major problem in the country.

Over the last decade, India has been experiencing unprecedented GDP growth at an average of 8%. However we are now facing a dip. The current year's growth is no more than 5%. We had been very

happy that poverty reduction in the decade of 2000 has been around 1.7%/year, and we hope it will continue. But we do not know what will happen with the dip in GDP growth.

Along with this, we have a new concern: until 2005, India had relatively low food price inflation. But since then food price inflation has been going up and up. Currently food price inflation is at 15%. We could cope with inflation at the time when GDP growth was also high. But now, with the 5% GDP growth and the 15% food price inflation, government is worried about the food security of households. In order to prevent potential adverse impact on household food security, India enacted the National Food Security Act. The Act envisages food grains – rice and wheat mainly – to be provided at very highly subsidized price (2 to 6 cents per kilogram). The government bears the cost (approximately 20-25 cents per kilogram) of the subsidy. It is expected that next year, when this food security programme is fully implemented, the current Food Subsidy Bill, which is 1% of GDP, will likely rise to 2%. Economists are worried about that.

But nutritionists are also worried. We believe that mere food grains are not sufficient to improve nutrition security. Women are the ration card holders in the Food Security Act so we hope to talk to them and convince them that the amount of money they are saving on the huge food grain subsidy should be reinvested in pulses and vegetables to provide their families with balanced meals. Will we succeed? We have to wait and see.

India has the world's highest rate of low birth weight babies. One third of our infants are born weighing less than 2.5 kilograms. Twenty% of our children are stunted at birth. Stunting doubles in the first five years, and undernutrition, if assessed using underweight rates, becomes about 50%. But in an era where there is a double burden, we have to consider weight-for-height and for age (BMI for age) as an important criterion for early detection and effective management of both over and under nutrition, especially in countries with high stunting rates. If you look from this perspective, India presents quite a different picture: seventeen% of our under-five children are undernourished if assessed using BMI for age, and 2% are overnourished. Maybe we should see this as an opportunity to ensure that the 17% wasted children comes down by half in the next ten years, and we do not allow the overnutrition rate to go up from the current 2 to 3%. This is our hope but again, will it be materializing? We have to wait and see.

We know that 20 to 25% of our adults are undernourished and about 12% are overnourished. But look at it again from the other side: about 65% of 1.2 billion people are normally nourished. With the Food Security Act, we do have a weapon to fight energy deficiency and undernutrition. Hopefully the aware population will take advantage of the current efforts to increase physical activity and vegetable consumption in a very big way. Then, perhaps, we can say, at the end of ten years, that we have succeeded in at least ensuring that there is no further deterioration in nutritional status if not massive improvement.

Comprehensive African Agricultural Development Programme (CAADP)

The CAADP/NEPAD led initiative on nutrition capacity development involves all sub-Saharan Africa with the support of a wide range of development partners. Three workshops have been held where multi-sector country teams led by CAADP focal points from Ministries of Agriculture discussed how to better integrate nutrition objectives and activities into their Investment Plans. A short film on the CAADP Nutrition Capacity Development Workshop was screened. Areas identified as key in terms of follow up to the workshops include:

- Investing in stronger information systems, especially for integrating diet and nutrition indicators into food and agriculture information systems.
- Integrating nutrition education, especially for extension systems, for which more investment is required.
- Changing the focus from production strategies focused on staples to those oriented towards more diversified foods. This requires revisiting how inputs, extension, and agricultural training is designed and delivered.

LESOTHO

Maternal and child malnutrition is a national problem in Lesotho with serious consequences for survival, growth, healthy development and economic productivity for individuals and society. Addressing chronic malnutrition is a basic foundation for the social and economic development of any country.

Unfortunately, for Lesotho according to Lesotho Demographic and Health Survey (LDHS 2009), 39% of Basotho children suffer from stunting (chronic malnutrition), which is more severe in the highlands region of the country. Iron deficiency anaemia is also a threat to maternal and child health, affecting 30% of pregnant women and 47% of children under the age of five. Lesotho also faces a double burden of malnutrition with an emerging problem of overweight and obesity in later age. The LDHS (2009) report indicates that 42% of women aged 15-49 are overweight. Furthermore, Lesotho experiences chronic food insecurity characterized by late onset of rains, recurrent drought and floods resulting in 77% of the rural poor being food insecure of which 55% rely on subsistence farming as their main livelihood source. This implies that the resilience of communities is depleted by cumulative effects of poor harvest. Therefore the bulk of household food comes from purchases yet food prices are also increasing, making it almost impossible for poor households to meet their food requirements.

Malnutrition accounts for a third of deaths in children, leaving those who survive at risk of morbidity and low cognitive development and function. In Lesotho, malnutrition is one contributing factor to the high under five mortality rate (117/1000 live birth) and poor performance in primary school (repetition rate of 19.4%). Inadequate dietary intake during complementary feeding period accounts for sub-optimal micronutrient intake. Basotho children are weaned on a monotonous high carbohydrate diet with some green leafy vegetable and insufficient animal protein. The causes of malnutrition happen at individual, household and community level. Therefore the Food and Nutrition coordinating office which is under the Prime Minister's office is mandated to coordinate all sectors dealing with food and nutrition issues.

Several interventions have been put in place by the government such as the Smallholder Agricultural Development Project, school feeding programmes, infant and young child feeding programme and the Government of Lesotho/UN Joint Nutrition Programme. There is a National Nutrition Policy awaiting endorsement by the Cabinet. It is a tool and guide to be used during the establishment of strategic action within the nutrition sector. The policy is to provide effective advocacy to mobilize the resources required in order to implement the government's short term and long term interventions. In addition to the National Nutrition Policy, Lesotho signed the CAADP compact and have the National Strategic Development Plan (2012/13-2016/2017) which highlight the need to join forces to reduce malnutrition. Despite all this interventions malnutrition still remains a problem in Lesotho.

Challenges

- Limited political commitment.
- National nutrition coordinating mechanisms are not functioning well.

- Limited technical capacity for implementation of nutrition programme.
- Limited access to antenatal care and child health care services.
- Social cultural practices and beliefs affect child feeding.
- Food diversity does not meet standards.

Lesotho hopes to share and learn from other countries experiences on how to effectively and efficiently address nutrition problems during the ICN2.

AUSTRIA

Austria's Nutrition Action Plan follows a horizontal "health in all policies" strategy and constitutes an umbrella for coordinating Austria's nutrition policies. It aims at the implementation of effective measures to reverse the trends of over and undernutrition, the reduction of still rising overweight and obesity rates by 2020, as well as the reduction of diet-related chronic disease.

Current national activities are focused on the following populations: infants, children, adolescents, pregnant and nursing women, socially disadvantaged and elderly people. The Austria Nutrition Action Plan is also focusing on settings where these groups can be met frequently and on the development of tools for raising awareness and improving nutrition competence.

A National Nutrition Commission was established in November 2010 which provides scientific advice for the Federal Ministry of Health in aspects of health and consumer related food policy. The members act as key disseminators of information and have given nutrition policy in Austria "a face", for the first time. Examples of Austrian nutrition activities are:

- Implementation of food based dietary guidelines including the development of an easily comprehensible food pyramid.
- The "School Cafeteria" programme, which is a national public health initiative led by the Federal Ministry of Health to improve food offered in school cafeterias.
- Elaboration and implementation of national standards for complementary feeding, through "Healthy Eating from the Start", which is a programme focused on workshops for young mothers and families with newborns.
- The Austrian Salt Initiative, which is an agreement between bakeries, the Austrian Economic Chambers, and the Federal Ministry of Health to reduce salt content in certain bakery products by 15% by 4 years.
- The Austrian Trans Fatty Acid Regulation.
- The Austrian Nutrition Report (updated every 4-5 years).

Like Spain, I would like to draw attention to the problem of food waste. In Austria, we have started various campaigns to handle this moral, environmental and economic problem. One of these campaigns is called "Food is Precious". This campaign takes a holistic approach, including for sustainable agriculture, nutrition and waste prevention. It aims to prevent food waste at all stages of the food chain from purchase and storage through to consumption. Another campaign is working with media to reach young people. However we not only address final consumers, but aim to reach all stakeholders along the chain. We have brochures and a food sharing platform and various rewards. There are guidelines for food sharing with social institutions.

Given this background and the work already done by FAO as a knowledge organization, Austria is glad that FAO is continuing to work in this area. Austria has repeatedly called for Voluntary Guidelines on Food Losses and Food Waste similar to the recently developed Guidelines on Land Tenure.

ICELAND

Iceland welcomes the ICN2 in the coming year, especially since food security and nutrition is central to the work of FAO. Nutrition is an important part of the Icelandic development cooperation and the messages we want to get across to the member countries of the FAO. A few issues regarding our national policies, positive developments, important partnerships and topics could be included in the ICN2 discussions.

Good nutrition is an integral part of the Action Plan of the Icelandic Directorate of Health for the years 2012–2016. A part of the policy goals is to create good conditions for healthy living with regard to nutrition and physical activities. Prior to 2016 we want to create guidelines and checklists for health policies and the forming of programmes for nutrition and healthy physical activities, among other things for health promoting communities. Another aim is the mapping of inequalities in health followed by an action plan to increase health equity.

Speaking of partnerships, Iceland has a close cooperation in these matters with other countries, especially Nordic countries. Through this cooperation we have created various policies and tools. The new Nordic Nutrition Recommendations are important in this respect. The Recommendations are a result of an extensive review of all relevant policies and information on the relation between nutrition and health. We have launched a labelling (set up the so-called Nordic keyhole) mechanism which will be a useful tool for the general public to choose healthier options in an easy way. This mechanism was adopted in Iceland formally yesterday, and I am happy to report this positive development. The experience of other countries is that such a mechanism is a boost for food producers and an encouragement to produce more healthy food.

Proper school meals are essential, as we have heard so clearly here today. The first years of a child's life are crucial for later development. That is why there is a strong emphasis on health promoting school projects run by the Icelandic Directorate of Health. The aim is there will be health promoting schools (pre-primary and secondary schools) all around the country by the end of 2016. In 1999 Iceland became a partner in the joint programme of the EU, the Council of Europe and the WHO of strengthening public health through schools. Partnerships are essential for success. School feeding has been an important part of our development cooperation, especially in cooperation with the World Food Programme.

As a food producing and exporting country, food security, healthy food and nutrition is essential for our country and our economy. We have emphasized the nutritional value of fisheries products, providing millions of people with necessary protein. We would like to draw attention to fisheries and aquaculture. Twelve% of humankind lives off of fisheries. These sectors provide 17% of the global population with protein and 25% in the developing world. We have called for better health inspections, reducing waste and losses, solid traceability, eco-labels and the sustainable management of natural resources, as well as gender aspects of good nutrition to be taken into account.

All these issues are of importance for FAO member countries and for the discussion at the ICN2 and are part of the chairmanship programme of Iceland in the Nordic Council of Ministers next year, under the headline “Nordic Bio-Economy”, aiming at securing healthy living of future generations.

MADAGASCAR

The Malagasy Government realizing the magnitude of the problem of malnutrition established the National Office of Nutrition in 2005 to coordinate activities against malnutrition. Malnutrition in Madagascar is characterized by protein-energy malnutrition and micronutrient deficiency. Chronic malnutrition is experienced most in areas where there is food insecurity. The diet consists mainly of carbohydrates; meat consumption is very low (2kg per capita, per year) and fruits and vegetables are not well integrated into eating habits.

A National Plan of Action for Nutrition was developed by all stakeholders in the nutrition sector. An effort has been undertaken to integrate nutrition into agriculture. Madagascar signed the CAADP compact where nutrition has been integrated. Plans are underway to implement the results of research for the benefit of producers and consumers. The private sector plays an important role in the fight against malnutrition (i.e. food fortification, promotion of local products). Our gap lies in the lack of data, and the fact that the various interventions do not yet cover the breadth of the country.

CHILE

The National Health Survey in Chile showed that 29.3% of the population is overweight, 25.1% obese, with highest rates among the poorest educated. People are sedentary, 78% of the population engage in physical activity less than 3 times per week, again with the highest rates among the poorest educated. There is high risk of diet related chronic disease resulting in reduced life expectancy, especially among vulnerable groups. All this has high public health costs.

As a result of this survey, the government has designed public and private programmes for 2011-2020 to reverse these trends. The focus is on lifestyle to control risk factors. Currently the programme is carrying out intersectoral work including health, education, and housing. The private and public sector are both involved in this effort to create a new culture. The programme is called “Choose to Live a Healthy Life” and involves campaigns to get the public actively involved in changing their lifestyles. In addition, specific targets were set to reduce smoking, excessive consumption of alcohol and to improve diabetes and other disease control. The programme is multisectoral and broad in scope. Please visit our webpage *Elige a Vivir Sano* for more information.

PERU

The advances and progress made by Peru in fighting malnutrition were achieved thanks to a long term intersectoral effort implemented by national and local government. We have achieved Target 1 of the MDGs and reduced overall malnutrition in children under five, from 10.8% to 4.3%. Chronic malnutrition in children under five has been reduced from 36.5% to 13.5%. Undernourishment decreased from 100 million to 3.3 million between 1992 to 2002.

In 2004, since the National Plan was developed to eradicate hunger, a number of programmes have been developed by the central government and implemented by local government. Since 2007, evidence-based interventions have increased, including interventions to reduce micronutrient malnutrition, and to improve hygiene, maternal care, and social programs.

All this was done by taking both health and social programmes on board. Peru is committed to provide coverage to areas where there is greater social exclusion. Budgets have been increased to fund activities in these areas. Peru has established a ministry for social development to reduce poverty and promote social inclusion. The Ministry of Social Development has two major programmes to support families:

- “One Cradle More” to improve physical and mental development of girls in poor urban and rural areas. This is done in two ways, through daily care centers that offer nutrition education and other social support, and through direct assistance to families.
- Providing food and education in public schools at pre- and primary school level to improve school attendance and dietary habits of children. The community is involved and accountable for these programmes.

Peru is also planning a second phase programme. We have developed a law to promote healthy diets and implementation rules for this law. In Peru we are convinced that long term state policies with inclusion of local and regional authorities will make it possible to be successful in the fight against malnutrition, this within a framework of social development and social inclusion.

NORWAY

The first nutrition policy was adopted in Norway in 1976. After that, we have had several policy documents. However, when the ICN was organized in 1992, it was useful for us because it gave inspiration and an opportunity to strengthen our effort in nutrition work. Our work with nutrition since then has been in line with the recommendations from the ICN.

In June this year, a white paper on public health was adopted by the Norwegian Parliament (the Storting). In this white paper, nutrition is integrated with physical activity and several other elements of public health work. The white paper highlights the need for multisectoral cooperation – a “health in all policies” approach – and the necessity of cooperation with civil society and the private sector, namely the food industry. The white paper also highlights the importance of the WHO global targets and indicators on non-communicable diseases, and follow up at the national level.

In 2007, the first nutrition action plan in Norway was launched for the period 2007-2011. Twelve ministries participated in this work, which was chaired by the Ministry of Health. Among the ministries was the Ministry of Fisheries, the Ministry of Agriculture, the Ministry of Education and also the Ministry of Finance. The implementation of the Action Plan has been evaluated by the WHO Regional Office for Europe the report of which is available. Two of the results from the evaluation:

- though twelve ministries participated in development of the plan, when it came to implementation the Ministry of Health was responsible for around 60 of the 73 measures in the plan indicating ownership in sectors other than health was less than desirable
- social inequalities in diet (and health) is a challenge in Norway as in many other countries. One of the main goals in the action plan was to reduce social inequalities in diet. The evaluation team noted that this goal should and could have been better followed up – and monitored better.

One key element in the action plan is the holding of “dialogue meetings” with the food industry, once or twice a year. These meetings have been useful for all and will continue. An important measure in the action plan, and in our cooperation with the industry, has been the further development and implementation of the Swedish keyhole symbol for healthy food choices mentioned by Iceland.

As noted by Iceland, there is close cooperation between the five Nordic countries in food and nutrition and we hope to present more elements of the Nordic cooperation at the ICN2. Possible topics for ICN2 include the right to food approach and breastfeeding. One issue where Norway has worked both at national level and at the Nordic, European and global level is the marketing of unhealthy food and beverages to children. This issue might be discussed as a part of how food systems can change to promote better nutrition.

ITALY

As the Italian focal point for the Second International Conference on Nutrition and Representative of the Italian Research Centre on Food and Nutrition I would like to share with you some experiences that my country has had at national and international level, that I believe can provide a useful contribution to this work session and to the debate of this Preparatory Technical Meeting. I start by sharing with you the work being carried out through a coordination effort among the various ministries working on nutrition, health and development, and also give you some elements of our Country's commitment at the international level in promoting Italian best practices and lessons learned for sustainable agriculture, nutrition and health.

Through a collective and coordinated effort the Ministries of Agriculture, Health, Education and Research, together with their technical institution, the Center of Research on Food and Nutrition (CRA-NUT), the Institute of Public Health (ISS) and the National Council of Research (CNR) are working together to elaborate a policy document "Italian Guidelines for Healthy Nutrition", which aims to improve food consumption patterns and nutritional well-being of individuals and populations.

The "Italian Guidelines for Healthy Nutrition" is a tool for translating food and nutrition policy recommendations into food-based dietary advice. The general philosophy of these Guidelines is that they should be based on the relation between diet and health and should be part of an integrated strategy to improve food security, food safety, nutrition and health. They provide advice to the public by disseminating quantitative and/or qualitative dietary advice relevant to different age groups and lifestyles. This work, expected to be completed in 2014, is funded by the Ministry of Agriculture and is carried out by the Centre for Research with the support of an editorial board composed of the Ministry of Health and Ministry of Education, as well as technical institutions from the health sector, such as the National Institute of Public Health and Academia.

The paper serves as guidance for food, agriculture and trade policies as well as a tool for implementing food and nutrition policies and programmes. It is also a tool for communication and education for promoting desirable food consumption patterns, nutritional well-being, and for the prevention and control of nutrition-related diseases.

In addition, other initiatives are already in place in Italy. One of the entry points for promoting healthy food practices and behaviour is education. This work has started in schools, with the elaboration of National Guidelines for School Feeding developed through concrete training activities for teachers. The National Guidelines for School Feeding aim to promote healthy nutrition in children and so prevent chronic degenerative diseases in adult life as a result of qualitatively inadequate food intake. School feeding is more than simple provision of a balanced meal. Rather, school feeding is recognized as an opportunity to disseminate good practices with the double objective of reaching children attending the school as well as families with take-home messages. The guidelines are addressed to school feeding

workers that are provided with a set of recommendations aimed to improve the quality of the services of school feeding, in particular in terms of nutritional value of meals.

Through training projects funded by the EU and implemented by the Ministry of Agriculture, teachers are trained on the importance of consumption of fruit and vegetables. Through this project nutrition and food topics are entering into school programmes and teachers and students are sensitized on the issues of nutrition, food security and the links between food and health.

The inclusion by UNESCO of the Mediterranean Diet in the List of Intangible Heritage of Humanity is a further confirmation of the role that nutrition plays in our country. The Mediterranean Diet is a set of food traditions, knowledge, handicraft techniques, representations and landscapes, recognized by the Mediterranean peoples as an integral part of their cultural heritage. It is the expression of an ancient history made of acquisitions, exchanges and adjustments, which are all reflected in the difference of food cultures, life styles and environmental conditions characterizing the Mediterranean region.

The Mediterranean Diet nutritional model has remained constant over time and space, consisting mainly of olive oil, cereals, fresh or dried fruit and vegetables, a moderate amount of fish, dairy and meat, and many condiments and spices, all accompanied by wine or infusions. It is often cited as beneficial for being low in saturated fat and high in monounsaturated fat and dietary fiber. One of the main explanations is thought to be the health effects of olive oil included in it.

In the transmission of this expertise, a particular vital role is played by women through their ability to preserve traditions and provide food education to their families. The Mediterranean Diet offers extraordinary potential to further enhance traditional and healthy eating habits and further promote the diffusion of a nutrition-sensitive food system.

The comprehensive efforts made by our country in promoting sustainable practices that are nutrition and health oriented, both from the point of view of production and consumption, are not limited, however, to the national scale. They also entail international cooperation activities, involving also developing countries.

At the European level, through the Joint Programming Initiative (JPI) “A Healthy Diet for a Healthy Life” Italy is working to designate a roadmap for harmonized and structured research efforts in the area of food, nutrition, health and physical activity. High quality diets and proper physical activity are the most critical determinants in human health and for the quality of life in an ageing society. At the same time, food production systems are challenged by increasing competition for biomass and the need to improve food security and sustainable production. Consumer expectations, for example regarding food quality, safety, price and convenience, are also changing.

Taking this into consideration, the aim of the JPI “A healthy diet for a healthy life” is to better understand the factors that influence food choices and physical activity behaviours, and thus human health, and subsequently to translate this knowledge into programmes, products, tools and services that promote healthy food choices. The JPI “A Healthy Diet for a Healthy Life” has three Joint Actions: the Determinants of Diet and Physical Activity; the Roadmap Initiative for Biomarkers for Nutritional/Health Claims; and the European Nutrition Phenotype Data Sharing Initiative. Italy participated in these three Joint Actions through the activity of three Ministries, (Agriculture, Health and Education/Research) acting through their technical institutions namely, the Centre of Research on Food and Nutrition, Institute of Public Health, National Council of Research. Italian participation to the

initiative is in kind, with provision of existing data and project results and in cash with provision of grants aimed to improve the capacity of networking of the in-kind initiative. The Joint Programme has launched its first action: “DEDIPAC”, the Knowledge Hub on the Determinants of Diet and Physical Activity. The Italian consortium of DEDIPAC is co-founded by the Ministry of Agriculture and Ministry of Research/Education. The other two Action Plans are in the process of definition of the structure and thematic areas of work. They will be launched in the first months of 2014.

As regards international cooperation with developing countries, Italy actively supports initiatives in the field of rural development, food security and nutrition, which are on top of the agenda of the Directorate General for Development Cooperation of the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Our commitment is translated into many interventions that the Italian cooperation is delivering in partnership with International Organizations aimed to promote best practices for sustainable agriculture attentive to quality of food, nutritional aspects and environmental sustainability.

In collaboration with FAO, for example, the Italian Development Cooperation supports programmes, especially in the Mediterranean region and the Middle East, aimed at contributing to the achievement of food security of rural populations while, at the same time, improving their nutritional status. This is done through the development and implementation of sustainable agricultural practices, with the direct involvement of the community of local farmers. Such interventions recognize the objective to increase agricultural production in a sustainable manner and, at the same time, to preserve agricultural biodiversity and protect environment through, for example, the reduction and elimination of chemical pesticides, the use of which has serious consequences for health and, in the long run, for the balance of ecosystems. The Italian Cooperation therefore aims at the promotion of sustainable agricultural practices for healthy crop management and, through the support to FAO actions in this field, to the development of strategies that are applicable at the local, regional and global levels.

The Italian Cooperation also supports the actions of WHO in the field of Nutrition for Health and Development, aiming to create an enabling environment for the adoption and implementation of development policies in developing countries focused on food and nutrition, with a particular attention devoted to the most vulnerable categories, such as pregnant women and children. In the framework of the process that will lead to the redefinition of the post-2015 development agenda, Italy aims to give centrality to issues such as food security, nutrition and the promotion of integrated rural development based on the primary role of small-holders that are already on top of its agenda.

FIAN

As a representative of Civil Society, we have had difficulty in providing direct inputs to the ICN preparatory process. This is a departure from the experience of the CFS, which was reformed in 2009 and for which there is strong Civil Society participation. We would like recommend that Civil Society be more involved in the ICN2 preparatory process in a more organic fashion. I am not just talking about NGOs but also about social movements and the organizations that represent the people on the ground. Several countries have mentioned the need for action at global as well as national levels. There are issues that need to be tackled at the global level in terms of governance. We believe it is fundamentally important to have some mechanism to guarantee inputs from civil society, not only during but before the Meeting, as is done for the CFS. However we need a new mechanism to guarantee pre, during, and post-participation of Civil Society in the ICN2 process.

UNICEF

UNICEF would like to speak on behalf of a specific population: very young children. In this Preparatory Meeting, we are talking about a series of issues which we hope will be put on the ICN2 agenda. In addition to the many wonderful inputs and specific comments, I would like to echo what Sierra-Leone and Norway have mentioned: We have been talking about food systems, food policy, strategies, and different approaches including agriculture and other nutrition-sensitive areas. Research shows that, arguably, the most crucial period to realize the right to adequate food and nutrition security is the first 1,000 days of life, the period from pregnancy up to two years. If we do not get it right in that period, we now know that we do irreparable lifelong damage. If we look at infants – the most vulnerable group in our populations – breast milk is the ideal way to realize this right to food and food and nutrition security. However, at the moment we estimate that less than 40% of infants are exclusively breast fed. This situation needs urgent improvement. If realized, this improvement will lead to an enormous reduction in morbidity and mortality and will most likely have a positive impact on non communicable disease. Nothing but good can come from this. We therefore urge that breastfeeding receives a special place in the deliberations and the documentation of ICN2.

CHAIR'S REMARKS

The Chair noted much progress is being made all over the world. Not everything is going exactly as one would wish but extraordinary and exciting efforts are underway. Many countries are now part of a worldwide effort to improve food and nutrition security. The Chair summarized the ideas and lessons learned from the rich mixture of experiences which had been presented during the Session as follows:

- The importance of getting development policies right by making social inclusion, equity, women and children explicit considerations.
- Making sure that people are at the centre of the policy formulation process.
- The importance of nutrition education, advocacy and communication through media and established nutrition networks and fora.
- The need for committed governments to inspire, stimulate and mobilize to accelerate progress on nutrition.
- The need to better monitor and evaluate nutrition impacts across sectors.
- The recognition that civil society, parliamentarians and other stakeholders are all part of the political process, and that political commitment is essential to scaling up nutrition.
- The need for comprehensive policies that address the multiple burdens of malnutrition, based on scientific evidence and good practices. The need for better multisectoral coordination and more sustainable funding mechanisms.

Additional points made during the Session by the Chair support these conclusions. These points were made in response to individual country statements and include:

- Working vertically up and down different levels of government, as well as horizontally across sectors: The need for national government to work with local government, especially in terms of joint financing and performance indicators, to create ownership of nutrition programming at different levels of government.
- Strong civil society involvement to avoid the ups and downs of national politics: Building a base of networks comprised of important stakeholders such as medical practitioners and education professionals can sustain a people centered approach which makes helping households the first priority. Community mobilization and empowerment are powerful forces for change.

- Juxtaposition of economic development and nutrition policies: Made possible through the combined efforts of government and the private sector, this approach aims to achieve multiple objectives for a range of stakeholders. The Chair noted that dairy sector initiatives, school feeding programmes, and cash transfers were examples of activities cited by countries which juxtapose economic development and nutrition objectives.
- Use of instruments such as national nutrition policies, advocacy tools and implementation matrices, as well as the placement of nutrition in national development plans, to achieve multisectoral coordination.

ANNEX: COUNTRY STATEMENTS SUBMITTED TO THE ICN2 SECRETARIAT AFTER SESSION 2

ARGENTINA

We welcome the holding of this meeting and, while acknowledging some limitations as previously indicated, find the presentations and discussions generated most interesting.

Argentina participated in the ICN 1992 which served then as a real encouragement to reorient food and nutrition policies in the country.

The main nutritional problems our country faces today is obesity starting from a young age and high mortality levels resulting from non-communicable diseases associated with unhealthy diets and low physical activity.

Actions that have been implemented in the country include the Healthy Argentina Plan (Plan Argentina Saludable) and the 2003 National Plan for Food Security (Plan Nacional de Seguridad Alimentaria). We are working in Mercosur to achieve greater effectiveness but this is not sufficient. Argentina considers it necessary that the ICN2 in 2014 supports breastfeeding and the International Code of Marketing of Breast-Milk Substitutes. Furthermore, we strongly believe it would be very useful to consider guidelines for an advertising code on food marketing and commercials aimed at children, as indicated in various publications from the Regional Offices of the Americas and Europe and WHO.

We are ready and willing to contribute to this initiative.

Thank you.

SUDAN

Data on food availability in Sudan shows that per caput energy contribution is mostly from cereals, oils and fats. Protein is provided mostly by cereals, milk, nuts and oilseeds and pulses. Cereals are therefore the major contributors of both energy and protein, hence their availability is the most important factor to ensure food security.

Most of the reports on nutritional status in Sudan are carried out by the Nutrition Department in the Federal Ministry of Health. These reports are supported mostly by UNICEF, the primary survey population is children under five years old. The most recent report showed that one in seven Sudanese children is wasted, and that one in three is stunted. Stunting is more prevalent among rural mothers and those with low education. Sudan is facing many problems including conflicts, separation and migration from rural to urban areas. These affect the food security of the community resulting in poverty, malnutrition and children dropping out from school

Many approaches to meet these challenges were adopted by the government, leading UN agencies and local NGOs. The “Joint Program for Creating Opportunities for Youth Employment in Sudan” is a two year program (November 2009 to October 2011, extended till August 2012) implemented by

government and by 11 UN agencies. The main aim of the programme is to provide skills development, livelihood and employment opportunities for youth aged between 15 to 25 years with a focus on girls and women. The outcomes of the project include increased job opportunities.

WHO recommended formula diets, F-75 and F-100, prepared from dried skimmed milk, sugar, cereal flour, oil, mineral mix and vitamin mix are used for the treatment of severely malnourished children in hospitals. Other interventions implemented in Sudan to reduce malnutrition are promotion of exclusive breast feeding and salt iodization. Challenges include the different food consumption patterns and food habits in Sudan, high rates of illiteracy and migration. Sudan recommends the ICN2 agenda looks at food fortification programmes to eliminate especially deficiencies in vitamin A, iron, zinc, and iodine as well as school feeding programmes.

IRELAND

Ireland welcomes the ICN2 and the opportunity to have preparatory discussions to shape the context and content of the conference. The main priority is to actively work with other relevant Government Ministries in a cross-sector approach to achieve progress and make a marked improvement in the reduction of obesity in children and non-communicable disease. Our Minister for Health launched a Healthy Ireland Strategy aimed to change either economic demand or production practices. This Strategy provides a framework for action to improve the health and well-being of our country over the coming generation. Healthy Ireland takes a whole of Government and whole of society approach to improving health and well-being, and all Government Ministries have endorsed its implementation. The goals of Healthy Ireland are to:

- increase the proportion of people who are healthy at all stages of life
- reduce health inequalities
- protect the public from threats to health and well-being; and
- create an environment where every individual and sector of society can play their part in achieving a Healthy Ireland.

Nutrition targets are set within this context and Ireland is preparing a National Nutrition Policy for publication in December 2014. The Ministry of Health will take the lead in developing the Nutrition Policy liaising with other key Ministries such as Agriculture, Food and Marine, Social Protection and the Ministry for Children. This inter-departmental, cross-sector approach reflects the international experience of a new commitment to public health nutrition with a focus on prevention. Progress can only be achieved by multi-sector co-operation.

Ireland would like to see this multi-sector approach as a key focus of the ICN2 conference to encourage strong linkages across health and agriculture, where a health in all policies approach, including implementing coherent policy actions, is considered for achieving win-win outcomes for both nutritional health goals and agriculture goals.

Nutrition goals need to be explicitly considered in policy-making for food and agricultural systems. As these systems are primarily profit-driven, to be successful, nutrition-enhancing policies need to change either economic demand or production possibilities or both. This is because nutrition-enhancing food systems will only succeed if their outcomes are compatible with market signals reflecting the behaviour of consumers, producers, processors and retailers. The relationship between nutrition and economic growth should be seen as a win-win. A malnourished labour force results in low productivity, while improving nutrition outcomes increases productivity and economic growth.

To choose a specific topic for focus at the ICN2, the importance of a healthy start, especially the well-documented importance of the first 1000 days, from conception to age 2 years, should be given priority. Prioritising this topic will also contribute to the important awareness and understanding that a nutrition- sensitive social protection approach offers socially disadvantaged and vulnerable groups the opportunity of a healthy start in life which will have life-long positive social and health benefits.

DAY 2

SESSION 3

WHAT IS MEANT BY NUTRITION-ENHANCING AGRICULTURE AND FOOD SYSTEMS AND WHAT IS INVOLVED: THE LINKAGES BETWEEN AGRICULTURE, FOOD SYSTEMS AND NUTRITION

Presenter and Moderator:

Per Pinstруп-Anderson

Panelists:

Marie Ruel, Patrick Webb

Heather Danton

PRESENTATION – NUTRITION-ENHANCING FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL SYSTEMS⁷

Per Pinstrup-Andersen

Chair of High Level Panel of Experts for the CFS

Professor Emeritus

Charles H. Dyson School of Applied Economics and Management

Division of Nutritional Sciences

Cornell University

There are three reasons why agriculture is not as explicitly nutrition-enhancing as it could be:

1. Nutrition is nobody's sector. As such it is a question of ownership. There is no nutrition ministry or sector that is responsible for crossing over.
2. Nutrition goals may conflict with other goals. For example, if a farmer is asked to change her or his behaviour, they will ask for a justification. Will the change increase income or reduce risk?
3. Market signals. The market is not telling us that we need to work for nutrition. Moreover consumer behaviour is not rational.

We have to integrate nutrition goals with the other goals that are currently priority and running the system; in other words, it cannot be expected that nutrition goals will override other goals. This is what some call "mainstreaming", we need to mainstream nutrition so that we can achieve multiple goals at the same time. There are "win-wins" that can be captured within the food system but achieving them requires work.

Key pathways from agriculture to nutrition include:

- Food availability in terms of both quality as well as quantity, presented with the caveat that availability does not ensure good nutrition.
- Income – in kind or cash.
- Prices in regards to relative prices of food, as well as food versus non-food goods. These can be affected by government policies such as taxes and subsidies. Food prices can also be changed through agricultural research by increasing productivity of one crop relative to another through reducing unit costs of production. These changes impact relative prices as well as incomes for producers. Legume price inflation during the Green Revolution is an example of how this pathway can have a negative nutrition effect. Was this done for nutritional reasons? No. It was done for reasons of hunger. Maybe it was the right goal at the time...but it is not the right goal now. Now we need to maximize production of nutrients. The time for a narrow focus on the quantity of food (meaning in many cases the quantity of calories) is over as we now need to focus more on nutrients than we have in the past.
- Time demand or time allocation. Studies at Cornell and elsewhere show that the greatest challenge to nutrition sensitivity in agriculture is lack of time among low-income women. This is a gender specific issue: low-income women's work loads are increasing; greater effort must be made to offset this increase by improving productivity in tasks traditionally done by women.

⁷ Pinstrup-Andersen, P (2013). Nutrition-enhancing Food and Agricultural Systems. Rome: FAO.

Available at: http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/user_upload/agn/pdf/PTM-ICN2_05_Pinstrup_Full_Paper_2013-11-06.pdf

- There is a tendency to focus almost exclusively on the supply side of the food system for improving nutrition, but we need to focus on the demand side as well. It is not enough to produce more fruits and vegetables for example, as increased supply does not assure increased intake. Consumers may not want to eat such foods. So therefore we need to understand what is feasible at the level of the consumer and understand behaviour of consumers much better than we do now.
- Non-food factors that determine whether what is done in the food sector has a positive or negative nutrition effect. Interventions to improve access to clean water, sanitation, childcare, and primary health care need to be done in conjunction with nutrition-enhancing activities in agriculture.

What can be done in regards to policy formulation?

Policies are context specific. However there are factors likely to be found in most contexts. First there is likely to be poverty. As such we need to increase incomes. Part of the solution is through reducing the unit costs of production of those foods that we need more of. There is also a need to encourage diversity in production and in the marketplace, especially in regards to relative prices. This may lead to a more diverse diet and better nutrition. And there is a need – as previously mentioned – to recognize the importance of time allocation for low-income women.

It is also necessary to break the two-way causal link between the processing industry and the consumer. Over the next years we are gradually going to see the agricultural sector becoming more of a producer of raw material for the processing industry, the pace by which this process occurs depending on country context. Processing corporations defend their production of foods of minimal nutritional value by saying that these foods are what the consumer want. Consumers argue that they eat these foods because they are widely available and cheap. How can this two-way causal link be broken? The industry is in the business to make money and if consumer demand changes they will change too. On the other hand, can we change the processing industry and its influence on consumer demand so that both links are addressed simultaneously? This is an important subject for discussion. We cannot continue to talk about agriculture and nutrition without addressing this two-way causal link.

Finally, efforts to improve nutrition sensitivity within food and agricultural systems must be combined with efforts to improve sanitation, access to clean water, and other non-food factors that impact nutrition.

PANEL DISCUSSION

Marie Ruel

**Director of the Poverty, Health and Nutrition Division
IFPRI**

Dr Ruel focused on two points from Dr Pinstrup-Anderson's paper:

1. The paper states "Promising opportunities for nutrition improvements that can be made at national and regional scale are undoubtedly found in large scale policy interventions in the food system". While there is no doubt that the food system can be modeled differently to improve nutrition, the questions are how long will it take to do that and how well can the food system in the relatively short term reach the poorest of the poor and the nutritionally most vulnerable members of the household? The notion of either/or is not valid. While this point was made more clearly in Dr Pinstrup-Andersen's presentation than in his paper, we always remember

better what is in writing than in a presentation; as such the point needs to be underscored. We need both. We need food systems to change, though we don't know yet how this will improve nutrition. But we also need programmes and interventions that operate as social safety nets. Kitchen gardens and homestead food production systems are targeted at the poorest of the poor who may not benefit from larger scale policy changes. These populations are highly vulnerable and need to be reached now, before it is too late. It is also important to point out that, in terms of the impact these programmes can have, it's not just nutrition. That is another misconception, that agriculture has the potential to improve nutrition. Agriculture's greatest potential is to do all the other things – to improve livelihoods, increase incomes, improve women's empowerment, improve access to quality diets. So there may be a great deal of complementarity between large policies and smaller targeted programmes.

2. The second point was in reference to Dr Pinstrup-Andersen's comment in the 2013 Lancet Series on Maternal and Child Health, regarding the "fixation of the health and nutrition community on randomized controlled trials (RCTs) as the only legitimate source of evidence." The editorial argues that this fixation is one reason why little action has been taken to improve the nutrition sensitivity of food systems. However the comparison here should not be between programmes that we can evaluate with RCTs and food systems. Rather, the comparison should be between food and agriculture systems and health systems. Those are more at the same level. We can always evaluate programmes reversely with RCTs, even when those programmes are very complex, as we are gaining more and more experience with programmes that integrate different aspects, evaluating multiple outcomes. We look at different impact pathways. This is an important area in itself. We are building the evidence that agriculture programmes which integrate other components can have an impact on nutrition.

In terms of food systems, what methods and tools do we have to evaluate the impact of these programmes? It is true that RCTs cannot be used to evaluate large scale, national or regional policies. However there is a need to do better in terms of tracking impact of these policies. This can be done using different types of tools, including those which other sciences and disciplines have developed to look at monitoring and tracking policy impact. It is important to note that the same problem is presented when programmes are implemented at scale. There is no way to construct a counterfactual of what happens to those who do not have access to the programme, or to look at before and after implementation. That said, it is still important to evaluate, assess and better understand as opposed to rely on "potential". We are where we are now because we *haven't* set up systems to evaluate these complex processes. This is the current challenge. Dr Pinstrup-Andersen's arguments are convincing, as are his recommendations for making food systems more nutrition sensitive or enhancing. But we do not know how to implement these recommendations, and we know even less about how to evaluate their impact.

- **Moderator:** We need to talk about "how to do it". I tend to agree with Marie that we have more work to do before we can answer that question. There is also the question of how to evaluate large scale programmes where you cannot use RCTs. The moderator also noted the importance of the Lancet 2013 Series.

Patrick Webb
Dean of Academic Affairs, Friedman School of Nutrition Science and Policy
Tufts University

Dr Webb focused on three quotes from Dr Pinstrup-Anderson's paper:

1. "Cost efficacy of food and agriculture-based nutrition enhancing interventions has not been rigorously evaluated". This issue cannot be understated. There is a need to know not just what works but what works and at what cost, so that policy makers can choose among alternatives. Six multisectoral programmes active or recently closed in the same developing country were used to illustrate how widely such programmes vary in terms of cost. We need to pay much more attention to this kind of detail. Until there is a better understanding of how these types of programmes break down in terms of cost-benefit it will be difficult to answer the "how" question asked by Drs Pinstrup-Anderson and Ruel.
 2. "It is important to remember that reducing poverty is important, but insufficient to reduce malnutrition". It is necessary to understand not just average conditions but the distribution around that average. The progress of three countries in reducing stunting were highlighted, with Brazil identified as a success story "not just for the average, or for reducing stunting for the poor" but rather where stunting was reduced across all quintiles, thus reducing inequality in nutrition outcomes as well as of income poverty. This kind of success requires looking beyond averages to try and identify where the worst cases exist within a given population, and then try and achieve reduction of inequality around distribution of nutritional outcomes.
 3. "Food price fluctuations may contribute to transitory food insecurity and malnutrition. Policies to strengthen timely price information might reduce such negative effects." While the need to break down silos has been discussed, what has not been adequately addressed is disaster and emergency response's potential contribution to reduction of malnutrition. The thirty-four countries with the highest burdens of stunting in the world (2013 Lancet Series) are often the same countries that have been dealing with chronic conditions of conflict, infrastructure and systems destruction, as well as challenges to stable governance. There is also overlap between the high burden countries and countries with repeated exposure to natural disasters. The traditional approach to these challenges is to separate them out as different problems, with different funding windows, and different professional skill sets siloed for both emergency response and longer term development programmes. We need to move beyond this. The success seen in disaster management can be applied to conditions outside of disasters. The presentation made by Dr Nishida (Session 1) mentioned the pledges that were made during the first ICN to eliminate famine and starvation in man-made disasters. Although man-made disasters will probably never be eliminated, we have done a remarkable job of removing famine deaths in the last twenty years. The number of people affected by disasters has risen dramatically over the last century due to the increased incidence and scale of these events, but the number of people dying as a result of these disasters has fallen inexorably. There are a lot of lessons to be learned here about how to address nutrition in disasters that has relevance outside the disaster context. This sector needs to be better incorporated into the discussion.
- **Moderator:** Yes for sure we need to add costs. We also need to look at inequality as well as absolute poverty, we need to break down silos and we need to better integrate emergency response with longer term development initiatives. At a time when we have more and more

extreme weather events due to climate change, the fact that we are better at dealing with disasters is important and should be considered when developing longer term solutions.

Heather Danton
Director, SPRING Project

Dr Danton highlighted how a few key points from Dr Pinstруп-Andersen's paper are in line with findings from a series of workshops (Agriculture and Nutrition Global Learning and Evidence Exchanges) co-hosted by SPRING, along with USAID's Bureaus for Food Security and for Global Health. These workshops presented findings from a review of Feed the Future projects. With coverage in twenty countries, the Feed the Future platform provides a laboratory within which to start exploring the "how" of nutrition-enhancing agriculture project design and implementation. SPRING reviewed over 160 documents in anticipation of the workshops.

1. Win-win relationships between agriculture and nutrition. Although this concept seems logical to those at SPRING, we found that experts from a range of sectors who participated in the workshops were not using the same language. And it is not just semantics; there is truly very little experience in working together across sectors. Agriculture focuses at a broader level while nutrition tends to focus on the individual. This came up repeatedly in the workshops. When we ask frontline workers to put these two sectors together, we need to understand the challenge. Even among us in international fora, we do not speak the same language. It is even harder on the front line. We have to depend on the household to put that together for us. We need to listen to households.
 2. Even though we know reducing poverty is important but insufficient for reducing nutritional deficiencies, if we are using a systems approach, we have to remember that systems are comprised of people. At the end of the day each person working in each sector brings a unique set of expertise. We need to think about and be respectful of where we can learn up and down the chain. This issue can be thought of in terms of behaviour change. We usually limit our perspective to the most vulnerable, the most impoverished, or as the small commercial farmer. But actually we need to think about behaviour change more broadly. The concept held by nutritionists is very different from agriculturalists who are thinking in terms of promoting key practices. The two sectors have a lot to learn from each other. But more importantly, we have a lot to learn from the private sector. If we can start working towards increasing demand for nutrition from individuals, business will follow. As such how can we bring the private sector to the table? They are masters at building demand.
 3. Referring to the pathways between agriculture and nutrition as described by Dr Pinstруп-Andersen, although SPRING uses these pathways in their review, it wasn't always clear why Feed the Future projects chose to follow the pathways they did. In general, it is important to pay closer attention to contextual analysis. If there was better contextual understanding at local level, some of these projects might have chosen different paths, around design and particularly around measurement. The issue of metrics is important and Feed the Future has an important role to play in this work.
- **Moderator:** We need to listen and learn more to better understand the context and design interventions accordingly. One of the issues I hope we can discuss is improving the health of the

labour force. To what extent is this public good versus private concern? There may be need for broader intervention from the public sector.

Anna Larrey
Director of Nutrition, FAO

Dr Larrey spoke on what is meant by nutrition-enhancing agriculture and food systems using three scenarios:

1. A country where the area that is producing the most food also has the highest burden of malnutrition. What kinds of foods are being produced? What is done with this food? Let's assume that most of the food is sold. What happens to the money? This is a typical scenario that can be seen in many developing countries. As Dr Pinstrup-Andersen said, we need to look at non-food factors too. Maybe people in this type of situation are producing the food and eating it, and factors such as sanitation are causing the problem. But all the same it is striking when a region that produces the most food is the most malnourished.
2. A country where seasonality in one locality is a recurring problem in terms of food insecurity, and where in another region there is a district with a glut of food seasonally, leading to local sales made below market price and post harvest losses due to surplus within the same country. Here the food system has failed, or at least is not working well. The role of stakeholders – for example transportation professionals – and different sectors must be observed through a nutrition lens.
3. A country where sectors are siloed. Some years ago, the University of Ghana was asked to look at how FAO was integrating nutrition into its programmes in Ghana. Interviews were conducted with personnel from various sectors. An interview with the Director of the Crop Division of the Ghanaian Ministry of Agriculture revealed nutrition was not a consideration “We don't do nutrition”. A crop division does not do nutrition? In this context, the link between agriculture and nutrition is absent, and there is much to be done to show that agriculture can work in many ways to improve nutrition.

How can we work most effectively in these types of circumstances? Recommendations for improving nutrition through agriculture have been developed by FAO and others and have been used to strengthen agricultural programme and policy impact on nutrition. FAO has also played a leading role in building nutrition capacity in CAADP member countries through a series of workshops.

Diversification out of staple crops into more diverse range of foods is important. There is also need to integrate agriculture and nutrition in pre-service training. We cannot wait for people to become directors before advocating for these links. If the concept is included as part of in-service training, by the time government personnel are out of school and working, nutrition will be part of their paradigm.

In conclusion, the potential of the recently formed Global Panel for Agriculture and Nutrition for influencing governments to increase nutrition sensitivity in agriculture was noted. This Panel's members are high level and include FAO's Director General.

- **Moderator:** We still have a very serious problem with infrastructure, with storage, with transportation. A lot of food is rotting in one part of a country while people are going hungry in another part. This is also true at national level. We have large stocks of grain in some countries such as India, Thailand and Zambia but in some of these countries, much of that grain is rotting as we speak. So investment in infrastructure is essential. What can these stakeholder groups do? Is this a private or a public sector issue? What should governments do to facilitate movement of grain from surplus to deficit areas? There are a whole set of issues here that are closely linked to nutrition. Dr Lartey drew our attention to the FAO work in this area and also made the important point that we need to incorporate agriculture-nutrition understanding and knowledge into a much lower education level than we are currently.

INTERVENTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Claudio Shuftan

People's Health Movement

It is not about poverty alleviation, it is about disparity reduction. The “cake of wealth” is only so big. We need to cut the slices in a different way; this should be at the center of the ICN2’s focus. Although the issue of price fluctuations has been mentioned, we need to acknowledge the role played by the “casino economy” in the futures market, which currently determines global prices of major staple food crops. This issue should also be taken on board by the ICN2. We also talked about the most impoverished and vulnerable populations. However the concept should be that people are *rendered* vulnerable and impoverished. This framing increases accountability. The call to bring the private sector to the table raises skepticism. They are the “masters of building demand” and this is why NCDs are a problem. Consumers are not given a choice in the matter. Finally we should not be framing nutrition in terms of productivity. We should be framing it in terms of a human right. That is all that should be required as a mandate of the United Nations and civil society. Many of the presentations have provided a taste of “nutrition politics of the extreme center”. This is not what is needed. More research at this point is not needed. We need to come up solutions which are quite a bit beyond what the politics of the extreme center has offered. It is unfortunate that civil society has not been given space in this meeting to present our position. To quote the Director Nakajima in 1992: “Let the time not escape, for yesterday was the time to act”.

Robert Pederson

Aalborg University

My experience in regards to the “how” is that we need to completely rethink agriculture and food policies to achieve our goals. We need to think about whether we are going to fix the fringes of the policies, be it trade or agriculture, or whether we are going to completely rethink them. The common agriculture policy is extremely complex and has been developed for over fifty years. It consists of layering new policies on old structures to fix current problems. As such we need to “shake the policy box”, especially in the developed world, because existing instruments are unworkable. We are really talking about a paradigm shift in agriculture and policy, going from producing more to feed the world to producing more to feed the world adequately. One of the ideas for this shift coming out of the EU is the idea that we need a common food policy as opposed to separate agriculture, nutrition and health policies.

Mauro Ghirotti,
Minister for Foreign Affairs, Italy

When talking about “how”, the time frame is important. How to influence political decisions regarding policy, especially since the ICN2 will overlap with the final rush of the post-2015 development agenda process? How can the wealth of information, knowledge and experience presented at this meeting influence this process in a practical way? How can the ICN2 stock of the current nutrition situation? Unless the nutrition dimension is put forward in a straightforward way as a new global priority in the post-2015 agenda, we risk missing the opportunity.

George Kent
University of Hawaii

The emphasis here has been on interventions, and on how to select the right one based on evidence. There has been little attention paid to the kinds of discussion that ought to be made locally and in the community, and for which the international community could provide empowering facilitation and support. This is in contrast to data collection and reporting for international agencies, which has a disempowering element. One useful way to think about the challenges is in terms of building local nutritional self-reliance - not self-sufficiency - but self-reliance, meaning decisions are made locally to the extent possible based on the principle of subsidiarity. One way to approach this challenge is to give more thought to how a local food system would look, if it was not going to create and perpetuate hunger. If we work within a neo-liberalist economic model, there is zero hope of solving the hunger problem. We have to move outside that model and look at other options. We need to be open about this and put it on the table. One way to make the conversation understandable is to talk about the design of food systems in local communities. One challenging way to put the question is to ask, if we were to design an entirely new community, how would we design both the infrastructure and the social structure? Food production and the entire food process, is a social activity that can be organized many different ways. We need to look at this and understand it. That includes understanding pre-modern food systems as a way to guide us to better post-modern food system.

PANEL RESPONSE

Dr Danton

I am not sure I agree with the intervention about leaving out the private sector. I have spent time working with small business. They are a factor. If we leave them out of the discussion, we ignore their political pull and influence on consumers. This is not a paradigm shift, but the private sector is already there, and is up and down the food chain. Farmers are private sector. On the nutrition side, it is our job to drive a better understanding and realization. An analogy can be drawn with exclusive breastfeeding, once mothers see the positive impact it can have, they will change their behaviour accordingly. We need to do this with the private sector, we need to get the private sector to see that we are at a crisis point, 25% of women living in developing countries are already overweight and obese. The processing era is already here. As such, we need to bring in the private sector and hold them accountable. I predict they will begin to change their behaviour as the pressure on the labour force becomes more pronounced. In regards to consumer choice, we all have choice. It is our right to make a choice. But we must be informed, which is why I was trying to link my initial intervention back to behaviour change.

Dr Webb

I agree with the point regarding disparity, especially nutritional disparity. It really matters. For example, Nepal reports a stunting rate of 46%. But the variability around that average is very high, from around 30 to 70%. At the same time, we have to understand the top 10 countries in the world with the highest number of stunted children are the same top ten countries having the highest numbers for wasting. These are not separate problems. These countries also have some of the highest rates of micronutrient deficiencies and some of the fastest growing rates of childhood obesity. So a single kind of intervention for a single country is going to have a hard time addressing all this complexity, but that does speak to Robert's point about trying to come up with a common food and nutrition policy. There are countries that have tried to do this – Nepal, Haiti, Rwanda - by addressing agriculture, food and nutrition under a common platform or strategy. But we don't know how effective these are. So my final point comes back to the call for more evidence. In response to the intervention by Claudio Schuftan, the call for more concrete, empirical evidence is not necessarily a call for more research. It is really a call for transparency. We all work with budgets and we all need to be questioning the costs of what we are doing in regards to various alternatives. We also need to be sharing information on those costs more widely, so as to increase understanding of how to get the greatest impact in the most cost-effective way.

- **Moderator:** Any comments on nutrition as a basic human right? Particularly, how do we implement it as such?

Dr Ruel

I'd like to respond to Claudio Schuftan's criticism of framing nutrition in terms of productivity, as opposed to as a human right. I agree that nutrition is a human right. However I think that it is necessary to frame nutrition along productivity lines for advocacy. It is necessary to use this framing as a tool or argument to help promote nutrition among certain audiences such as trade and finance ministers, who are focused on economic growth. This framing is a useful argument, and it's true. But it is not at odds with the concept of nutrition as a basic human right. Rather it is just a question of which argument to use in a given context to assure maximum impact.

Dr Lartey

Regarding reducing disparities, we need to look at the issues more broadly. It makes sense to be looking at disparity reduction as it can help solve a lot of problems because one is not just looking at nutritional status but at a much wider range of challenges, such as access to basic services.

- **Moderator:** Could you speak to George Kent's point regarding creating a new community? Are some of the international activities really doing damage to local activities? How can they be supportive instead of disempowering?

One of the mistakes that is often made is that is coming into a community and thinking that what is being done is not the best way, and that things should be changed. Before anything happens, it is important to recognize and understand local knowledge; why people do things certain way, to be successful. It is really important to pay attention to local knowledge. Without this understanding, we can create a lot of problems.

- **Moderator:** In response to the comment on the "casino economy", the futures market originally worked well in reducing risk to farmers and in preventing transmission of risk. It was only after

the index investment was introduced that the futures market went crazy. Beginning late 2007-2008, it has been difficult to use it for what it was originally meant to do, namely, to diversify risk away from farmers. I also agree that the vulnerable are made vulnerable by existing institutions. As such we need action. And I acknowledge that there is too much rhetoric. Regarding the point about the post-2015 agenda, I think this is an issue for FAO and for WHO to deal with. However I do agree that what comes from this preparatory meeting should be fed into the process.

DAY 2

SESSION 4

WHAT ARE THE POLICY LESSONS LEARNED AND WHAT ARE THE SUCCESS FACTORS?

- **PANEL 1: Food value chains development and implications for nutrition**
- **PANEL 2: The influence of agrofood policies and programmes on the availability, affordability, safety and acceptability of food**
- **PANEL 3: Social Policies and Nutrition**
- **PANEL 4: Coherence between meeting dietary goals and the food supply - economic implications of changing food production and consumption patterns**

PANEL 1: FOOD VALUE CHAINS DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLICATIONS FOR NUTRITION

Presenter: Corinna Hawkes

Moderator: Philip James

Panelist: Miguel Gomez

- **Moderator:** So far this morning we have had a remarkable range of discussion, debate and also some controversy. We are continuing the discussion but now with a different perspective, looking specifically at the food chain, its operators, and its consumers.

PRESENTATION - IDENTIFYING EFFECTIVE POLICY TO ADDRESS THE MULTIPLE BURDENS OF MALNUTRITION: A VALUE CHAIN APPROACH

Corinna Hawkes

Head of Policy and Public Affairs, WCRF International

Dr Hawkes commended the WHO and FAO for focusing the ICN2 process on the multiple burden of malnutrition.

We know that in any given situation, there are several options available in terms of policies and interventions to address malnutrition. In terms of addressing NCDs and undernutrition, we know that part of the policy response has to involve harnessing the power of other sectors to improve nutrition governance and policy coherence. This requires multisectoral action, including in the food system. Dr Hawkes noted that addressing the food system was a cross-cutting issue in the broader framework⁸ of policy responses available for addressing malnutrition, as addressing the food system can facilitate other policy approaches as well as acting on its own.

What is meant by the “food system”? By definition, changing one aspect of any system means having an impact on another. This can get quite complicated. One way to make the concept more manageable is to think in terms of food supply chains. It is important, however, to note that the food system is not linear. Rather, using food supply chains allows us to better understand how every aspect or “link” in the system is important. As such, we are not just talking about agricultural production when we talk in terms of food systems. We are talking instead about inputs into production all the way to the plate, and all the policies that affect each aspect of that process. For example, in a modern food chain, a policy on food advertising targeting children, which affects demand counts as a food systems policy because of feedback loops back into the food system. It is very important to understand this.

It is also important to understand that food supply chains affect what we eat. Dr Hawkes cited the “Three As Framework” which looks at how agricultural policies (input policies, production policies and trade policies) affect availability, affordability and acceptability of food for consumers. These consumers include the food industry, including actors in small informal companies as well as large formal sector firms. These organizations “consume” agricultural products and transform them into products which influence the food environment, which in turn influences diets. Of course, demand as well as supply side

⁸ Dr. Hawkes referred to the NOURISHING Framework of policy actions for nutrition and NCDs: http://www.wcrf.org/policy_public_affairs/nourishing_framework/

dynamics matter. Policies that affect what we eat influence the food supply chain. This has repercussions discussed later in this presentation.

There are important differences between short and long chains. Short chains are characterized by a more direct, traceable relationship between production and consumption. Fruits, vegetables and legumes produced by smallholders and family farmers, often in low to middle-income countries, are typically the focus of these chains.

In contrast, longer chains include a number of steps mid-stream which significantly transform foods (e.g. from a chicken to a chicken nugget or an apple to apple juice). What is important about these chains is how they “blunt” the relationship between agriculture and consumption. In these chains, post farm-gate processing is far more important than pre- farm-gate production. This is essential to understand from a policy perspective.

It is not correct, however, to say that long chains are unhealthy and short chains are healthy. Rather the point is to recognize the differences between how long and short term chains function.

Value chains are one way of looking at how food supply chains function because they allow one to conceptualize how value (economic and otherwise) is created for different actors and activities in the chain. This value creation framing provides important information for policy formulation. From a nutrition perspective, value chain analysis can help identify how much different types of values are created by various actors and activities in a given food supply chain.

To date, most value chain analysis has *not* been used to promote nutrition but rather as a way for businesses to lower costs and increase profit margins. The approach is, however, gaining ground in agricultural and rural development, particularly for pro-poor economic growth, which presents an opportunity for nutrition. In other words, there is a need for value chain analysis in nutrition, and there is a lot of work going on in regards to value chains; this is what we need to bring together. For example, value chains can identify leverage points through which diets can be improved throughout food systems, including:

1. Creating value for nutrition through supply.
2. Creating value for nutrition through demand.
3. Enabling identification of coordinated, multi-sectoral solutions which we know are needed to address malnutrition in all its forms.
4. Meeting agricultural goals where economic value for agriculture and food system actors *and* value for nutrition are be created.

Value chain approaches should focus on specific problems within the context of the total diet. There is a risk in focusing too much on one food; rather it is important to look at nutritional problems within the context of the total diet. The following are examples of how value chain analysis can be used to identify effective policy solutions:

Example 1: Identifying policy actions to promote fruit intake in the Pacific Islands

The problem was low fruit intake. To identify a solution, barriers and solutions were identified looking at demand and supply side issues. This approach identified solutions on the supply side that would have been ignored otherwise.

Example 2: Global policy incoherence in fats

WHO recommends saturated fat reduction and replacement of saturated fat with unsaturated fatty acids. In contrast, the food supply chain is funding research into production of oils (namely palm oil) with high levels of saturated fats, it is opening up new lands for cultivation of those fats, is investing in smallholder production schemes due to lower limits on plantation size.

The World Bank has invested heavily in these fats in certain countries, trade policies are promoting their export, and there are also policies to promote their health benefits. So there is WHO on the one hand, and the supply chain on the other. This is not an efficient or effective way to manage nutrition policy, as the recommendations made by WHO are being undermined back in the supply chain. Health policy makers need to be engaging with the supply chain to talk about this incoherence.

Example 3: Trans fats policy in India

In 2010 the Food Safety and Standards Authority of India proposed a regulation to set an upper limit of 10% trans fat in partially hydrogenated vegetable oils. Value chain analysis of the potential repercussions of such a regulation, were it to pass, indicates that partially hydrogenated vegetable oil is highly valued by street food vendors, due to its low price point. In addition, increased investment in India's processed foods industry increases incentives to use fats with a long shelf life. Moreover, in agriculture, there's been limited investment in domestic production of fats and oils with healthier fatty acids profiles. This means that other saturated fats will be favored as a substitute to trans fats, whereas if there was more investment in healthy oil production, the health and nutrition incentives might be better aligned with market-based, food system ones.

Example 4: Saturated fats policy in Singapore

Singapore's Health Promotion Board wanted street food vendors or "hawkers" to use less oil with less saturated fat in their products, but encountered resistance due to price disincentives. As a result, the Board invested in supply-side solutions, namely research into 1) an oil blend that reduced saturated fat content without a prohibitive price increase, and 2) logistics to improve the efficiency of healthier oil supply chains, with concomitant reductions in cost. A special label was also provided to vendors signalling the use of healthier oil to consumers. These efforts were relatively successful and provide a good example of how public sector engagement with a supply chain can lead to a genuine shift in intake. That's said, a remaining barrier –long term, trusting relationships with oil vendors who were not selling the new oil blend – in some cases has impeded uptake.

These examples show how a value chain approach can be used to find concrete solutions to very complex problems. In conclusion, we need to act within food systems, we need good analysis to identify effective solutions, we need to evaluate these solutions, and these approaches need to be part of a package of approaches used to address malnutrition in all its forms.

- **Moderator:** Dr Hawkes covered a whole panoply of issues we need to dissect and discuss. Here we have been almost provided with a recipe for how to think things through and how to engage different actors in each of the links in the food chain.

PANELIST PRESENTATION - FOOD VALUE CHAIN TRANSFORMATIONS IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES: NUTRITIONAL IMPLICATIONS

Miguel Gomez

Ruth and William Morgan Assistant Professor

Dyson School of Applied Economics and Management

Cornell University

Dr Gomez presented findings from a recent review study⁹ of the links between food value chains (FVCs) and nutrition in developing countries. FVCs were defined as comprising all activities necessary to bring farm products to consumers, including agricultural production, processing, storage, marketing, and distribution. The pre farm-gate price of food is only 15 to 30% of the retail value of food. As such, post farm-gate aspects of value chains are important for understanding access and availability issues, as well as these issues' implications for nutrition.

The study's objectives were:

1. Examine how transformation of FVCs influences the triple malnutrition burden in developing countries.
2. Identify areas that require more attention from researchers and decision-makers.

The approach was to:

1. Develop an FVC typology that takes into account the participants, target market, and products offered.
2. Propose selected hypotheses on the relationship between each FVC category and elements of the triple malnutrition burden.

How have FVCs transformed in recent years? Here are some key background differences.

In 1980, about three quarters of the population in developing countries was rural, the share of labour in agriculture was almost 70%, and safety nets were limited to a small number of international food aid programmes in rural areas. Today, approximately half the population in developing countries is urban, share of labour in agriculture is less than 50%, and safety net coverage is wider, more varied, and often nationally owned and administered.

What do these changes mean in terms of FVC transformation? One major change is that the share of food reaching consumers through longer FVCs has increased. This can be attributed to rapid urbanization, income growth, and expansion of modern retailers, processors and distributors. While demand for products such as meat, dairy, fruits and vegetables is increasing, so is the market for processed food products. In addition, most rural residents currently depend on FVCs because most of them are net-food buyers.

The four food value chains described in the review study typology are as follows:

⁹ This study is part of a special section – Post Green-Revolution Food systems and the Triple Burden of Malnutrition - in the October 2013 edition of Food Policy:

<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/journal/03069192/42/supp/C>

1. *Traditional:* Traders buy primarily from smallholder farmers and sell to consumers and traditional retailers in wet, mostly local, markets.
2. *Modern:* Domestic and multinational food manufacturers procure primarily from commercial farms and sell through modern supermarket outlets.
3. *Modern-to-traditional:* Domestic and multinational food manufacturers sell through the network of traditional traders and retailers (e.g. “Mom and Pop” stores).
4. *Traditional-to-Modern:* Supermarkets and food manufacturers source food from smallholder farmers and traders.

Findings for Traditional FVCs:

Although the focus is often on market penetration of modern FVCs, in many countries, the fruit and vegetable market share of modern versus traditional FVCs was far higher for traditional. Even for middle-income countries like Thailand and Mexico, the majority of fruits and vegetables are purchased from traditional outlets. The situation is similar for meat products. Findings from Ethiopia show that for high, middle and low-income consumers, a majority of meat is purchased outside supermarkets, either through a butcher in a traditional wet market or at a special butcher shop.

These findings indicate that foods rich in micronutrients and proteins are being purchased by low income populations primarily through traditional outlets. Why is this? First, these outlets offer products at lower prices. Overhead and labour costs are much lower for traditional retailers than for supermarkets. That price differential has been documented in Asia, Latin America and Africa. Also, traditional retailers have much more flexibility in product standards. Finally, traditional outlets enjoy a flexibility and convenience of location which supermarkets do not.

At the same time, a major limitation of traditional retailers is access to post harvest and distribution infrastructure. This limits their benefit in terms of availability, especially in regards to seasonality.

Findings for Modern FVCs:

Despite a rapid expansion of modern supermarkets in developing countries, their nutrition benefits – namely reduction of micronutrient deficiencies by offering a wide assortment of products year-round for a diverse diet – may accrue only to urban, relatively wealthy households. One reason for this is that high standards make micronutrient-rich foods available in supermarkets less affordable to the poor. In addition, it appears that lower income households engage in ‘cherry-picking’ food shopping behaviour, buying processed foods in supermarkets, but not perishables.

As such, supermarkets increase demand for processed/packaged foods, which have (among other factors) been shown to contribute to obesity and overweight. There is also some evidence that low priced packaged/processed foods substitute for fresh produce and livestock products. Empirical evidence to examine causality between supermarkets and overweight malnutrition is needed.

Findings for Modern-to-Traditional FVCs

The market for processed/packaged foods is growing five times faster in developing countries than developed ones. Much of this growth is in sales to lower income consumers through traditional FVC retailers in urban and rural areas. For modern manufacturers of processed foods, these traditional

retailers offer simpler distribution channels than modern supermarkets, as the latter requires extensive negotiation.

These systems may have a mixed influence on nutrition, depending on the population group. They can help prevent or reduce undernourishment in some rural, remote areas but may also contribute to over-nutrition in urban areas for patrons of traditional FVC retail outlets.

There is growing enthusiasm for using these FVCs for public-private partnerships using business models targeting the poor. For example, addressing micronutrient deficiencies through development of new products and processes (e.g. vitamin-fortified yogurt from *Grameen Danone Food*); expansion of distribution networks (*SUN Network* partnerships with food manufacturers who have strong distribution networks); and through strengthened consumer demand (*Future Fortified* campaign by the Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition [GAIN] to encourage expectant mothers to consume nutrient packets). However the impact of such partnerships must be evaluated to guide donor, government and food industry actions.

Findings for Traditional-to-Modern FVCs

These FVCs may hold indirect value for nutrition in terms of the employment opportunities they offer, as increased income opportunities have repeatedly been shown to improve caloric intake in rural areas. However, little is known on how income opportunities impact diet diversification or their influence on micronutrient deficiencies. Moreover, farmers who participate in supermarket chains are generally those with superior endowments (land, education, etc.).

Dr Gomez concluded with the following points:

1. It is difficult to generalize the influence of food value chain transformation on nutrition
2. Interventions to increase the efficiency of traditional FVCs can improve access to micronutrients among both urban and rural poor populations.
3. Interactions between traditional and modern FVCs suggest the need for a more nuanced view of food chains.
4. There are opportunities for public-private partnerships to use food fortification to reduce micronutrient deficiencies.
5. Future research should aim to further unpack the links between FVC transformation and micronutrient deficiencies, for example, the extent to which packaged foods are being substituted for fresh vegetables and other foods rich in micronutrients.

- **Moderator:** This presentation has highlighted an additional set of issues: We need to think about the positive and negative effects of these transformations.

COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR, HIGHLIGHTS

Multiple comments were made regarding the challenge of policy coherence. How can the ICN2 ensure that all actors – especially civil society and multilateral investment institutions - are part of the dialogue?

Civil society was cited as an important stakeholder which had not been adequately engaged or recognized during the meeting. Also, in response to Dr Hawkes (see below), the importance, and challenges, of coherence within agencies was mentioned repeatedly. In this context, the importance of identifying appropriate entry points to better engage non-nutritionists was noted, as was the need to be better prepared with answers when non-nutritionists ask “what can be done” for nutrition. The need to train nutritionists in ways that include more of a focus on economics and social science was noted.

The issue of food safety in regards to food supply chains was raised, as was the issue of collecting data on how mothers are using food supply chains (traditional versus modern, long versus short). An intervention was made noting the importance of industrial food fortification in reducing micronutrient deficiencies. The speaker underscored challenges faced in developing countries regarding the logistics of fortification schemes, especially in terms of private sector involvement.

Interventions cited the need to recognize the political aspects of food systems policy, in terms of building relationships and in regards to political economy. Why aren’t the political implications of food policies being addressed in the international dialogue on nutrition sensitivity? A related comment noted the potential conflict between engagement with the food industry and its regulation. The speaker argued that the resources and inherent political power of the private sector needs to be taken into consideration. This intervention also cited the thin representation of civil society as indicative of disparities in representation at the meeting and in the discourse more generally.

PANEL RESPONSE

Dr Hawkes

In regards to policy coherence: First, it is important to recognize that, within the World Bank and other multi and bilateral financial institutions, the people involved in health and nutrition are often not the same as those involved in agricultural development and economic growth. As such, there is a need for greater internal dialogue on policy coherence. Second, the breadth of these challenges can be very overwhelming. Therefore, it is important to narrow the challenges to specific issues that can be addressed together with a range of stakeholders. In addition to identifying specific issues and stakeholders, it is also essential to identify objectives for these stakeholders as well as incentives that will bring them to the table. For example, WHO is currently leading a discussion on the formation of a UN Taskforce on NCDs. Should this initiative really be led by WHO or FAO? Or should it in fact be led by the World Bank or OECD? I would like to see that happen.

Dr Gomez

There are examples of public-private partnerships that are having a positive impact on certain populations in regards to micronutrient deficiencies. For example fortification programmes which use the processing industry to facilitate distribution.

- **Moderator:** Let us start with the coherence within an organization. Is there a process whereby we can begin to dissect out and produce frameworks that might apply to different steps in the value chains? How do we facilitate practical implementation of coherent steps? Or is that too naïve?

Dr Hawkes

In response to the moderator, Dr Hawkes called for more exploration and application of country experiences.

- **Moderator** referred to his personal experience in the Caribbean in regards to the issue of context specificity, citing the incredible complexity of working on a country-by-country basis, and posing the question of what might be possible at regional level.

Dr Hawkes

Reiterated that context matters. However, there are issues that can be addressed through global processes. Dr Hawkes noted that if all the countries at the meeting were to collaborate, they would likely identify common problems to be addressed internationally.

- **Moderator** referred to a recent series researching food chains in a number of African countries. He noted their dissemination to FAO, and their potential contribution to the ICN2 preparatory process.

Dr Gomez

Dr Gomez's final comment was in response to the intervention regarding the need for data on how mothers are using food supply chains. Dr Gomez noted that most food purchases in developing countries are made by mothers. As such, some information is already available. For example, use of sodas and other sweet drinks in Nigeria and elsewhere during weaning, especially in rural areas.

Dr Hawkes

Dr Hawkes concluded with the following points:

1. Regulating the food industry is an action in the value chain. It is required in some circumstances, particularly when consumers don't know what they are eating or when the food industry is promoting unhealthy habits among children. Regulation is in no way incompatible with engaging the food industry and agriculture on the supply side. It is possible to do both. Proper regulation will feed back into food supply chains, and engagement will improve industry response in other areas that may also affect the food environment.
 2. In regards to civil society, we need to do a better job *within* civil society of internal coherence. Dr Hawkes reiterated her earlier example of the NCD community not communicating sufficiently with the undernutrition community. Indeed there is a range of civil society organizations which are not working well together.
 3. Countries that attend the 2014 ICN2 Meeting should provide a clear set of policy options through which to engage with value chains, whether from an agricultural perspective or from a health and nutrition perspective. These should be discussed during the meeting and an agreed upon "Menu of Options" can be developed as a way to move the whole food system agenda forward.
- **Moderator** There has been a welter of demands for greater coherence and greater analysis, greater involvement of civil society, indeed how, within any one organization, to improve understanding of nutrition throughout the food chain. How are we going to do this in the next twelve months? In addition to influencing the 2015 development agenda, how can we make

ICN2 a platform for taking us forward in a dramatically better way in regards to increased policy coherence?

PANEL 2: THE INFLUENCE OF AGROFOOD POLICIES AND PROGRAMMES ON THE AVAILABILITY, AFFORDABILITY, SAFETY AND ACCEPTABILITY OF FOOD¹⁰

Presenter: John Humphrey

Moderator: Bruce Traill

Panelists: Hanns-Christoph Eiden, Delia Grace, Gert W. Meijer, Christiane Wolff, Alan Dangour

PRESENTATION – THE INFLUENCE OF AGROFOOD POLICIES AND PROGRAMMES ON THE AVAILABILITY, AFFORDABILITY, SAFETY AND ACCEPTABILITY OF FOOD

John Humphrey

Institute of Development Studies

Dr Humphrey qualified his presentation as focusing on how food based approaches can reduce micronutrient malnutrition, looking specifically at opportunities that are post farm-gate and market oriented. What are the incentives for business involvement in combating micronutrient deficiency? Is there unrealized potential for mobilizing business to combat micronutrient deficiencies among the poor? And if such potential exists, what types of strategies are most likely to allow businesses to realize it? Where can public private-partnerships be most effective?

Five food-based options for improving micronutrient malnutrition were presented:

1. Increasing dietary diversity through changes in household consumption
2. National or regional fortification of staple foods (e.g. salt iodization)
3. Fortified foods targeting specific groups (Grameen Danone's vitamin-fortified *Shokti Oi* yoghurt is a current example, also complementary foods for weaning and lipid based supplements)
4. Biofortification (orange fleshed sweet potato is the classic example)
5. Agronomic biofortification (e.g. zinc enhanced fertilizer)

If people who are nutritionally sub-optimal consume nutritious products, then their nutrition status tends to improve. But the challenge is to get these products to market in ways that maintain their nutritional value and that assures that those who need them most can access and consume them. In practice, this is not easy. Three preconditions must be met: First, the food must be safe. Second, it must maintain its nutritional quality and benefits up to the point of consumption. Third, it must be consumed by the populations whose nutritional deficiencies are being targeted by the intervention. Many nutrient-rich foods are inaccessible to the poor. These three prerequisites apply to any delivery of nutrients; they are not exclusive to market-based delivery platforms. But once we start thinking in terms of markets, a second set of challenges or prerequisites emerges. These were also outlined in Dr Hawkes' presentation on value chains and are as follows:

¹⁰ Henson, S; Humphrey, J (2013). The Influence of Agro-Food Policies and Programmes on the Availability, Affordability, Safety and Acceptability of Food. Rome: FAO.

Available at: http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/user_upload/agn/pdf/PTM-ICN2_06_Henson_Full_Paper_2014-01-07.pdf

1. **Nutrition awareness** – Buyers must be aware of the nutritional value of the product in question.
2. **Signaling** – Almost always, the nutritional value of food is a “credence good”. In other words, a food’s nutritional value is not immediately obvious, consumers cannot tell prior to purchase or during consumption whether the food really contains the nutrients it claims to have. For example there is no way a consumer can tell the difference between fortified and non-fortified oil. Therefore, there has to be some mechanism to signal to consumers, or convince them, that they are buying something worthwhile. Branding is one way that this issue is managed. Endorsement by government, or by certification bodies, are others.
3. **Acceptability** – There cannot be barriers to preparing and eating the product. How it cooks, how it needs to be stored, cultural acceptability, etc.
4. **Availability** –The product must be physically available in places where the target populations can purchase it. There is no point in developing and marketing a product if it remains unavailable to the target population.
5. **Affordability** – Target populations must be able to purchase the product. This could be seen in absolute terms, but equally it may be about willingness to pay and one food in the context of other possible purchases, food and non-food.

These challenges are interlinked. For example one way to solve the signaling issue is to market nutritious foods as premium goods at a high price point. This is a common approach but it destroys the affordability criterion that is essential for reaching vulnerable populations. A second example: It is often the case that meeting the availability criterion by developing distribution systems that deliver product to rural areas and places where the poor live, makes the product less affordable. The fact is, there are many nutrient rich foods available in developing countries. The problem is the poor very often cannot afford them, or even gain access to them.

In addition to these consumer-oriented challenges, we have to turn the picture around and think about businesses. What do businesses need? In addition to the market-oriented criteria as well as the three basic criteria listed above, it is really important for businesses that are selling nutritious foods to capture value. That is, there must be a return on the investments that businesses are making in the food system. Without that profit, there will be no long term investment. Credence issues are very important for capturing value. Credence is an issue because there is no way of telling whether a product really does contain the benefits that it claims. It is very easy for fraud and false claims to be made. These undermine the credibility of the product and the profitability of the business. There are also risks and uncertainties in innovation. First movers face problems with the risks and uncertainties of innovation. Given the context of selling nutritious products to the poor, there may be uncertainties in distribution and packaging as well as fundamental innovations in product and product design. Finally, there are challenges in regards to value chain integrity. How does one maintain the nutrient integrity of a product as it moves along the value chain? How does one secure safe inputs for your product? In order to ensure food safety and quality, some degree of control over food value chains is required. This is why businesses develop dedicated supply chains.

Overall, the picture is daunting. Is it possible at all to deliver safe, nutrient-rich foods to the poor through market mechanisms? While it certainly doesn’t appear to be easy, there are strategies through which the difficulties can be reduced and managed:

1. Minimize the acceptability challenge by focusing on foods that are very similar to foods that are already being consumed.

2. Minimize availability and affordability challenges by using existing distribution channels wherever possible, to keep costs low.
3. Minimize availability and affordability challenges by avoiding products that are highly perishable or need special handling, again to keep costs low.
4. Avoid the signaling challenge altogether. For example compulsory fortification removes the burden of choice for the consumer, since all products on the market are fortified.
5. Minimize the signaling challenge by focusing on food products whose nutritional characteristics are easily observable – such as vegetables.
6. Minimize the signalling challenge by combating false claims through regulation of branding and certification schemes.

All of these are examples of how to minimize challenges. We should also consider a second type of strategy, namely policy initiatives to offset costs and defray risks. These include nutrition awareness programmes, public distribution systems, feeding programmes and other public sector strategies which can promote demand and provide a large, guaranteed market for particular providers of food to overcome some of the start-up problems. Advance commitments can be offered to enable companies to get to scale, and public sector initiatives may also be able to solve some of the value chain integrity problems, for example by supporting out grower schemes as part of a broader agricultural development strategy. The implication of these types of policy initiatives is that most market-based initiatives for provision of nutrient-rich foods almost certainly require some kind of public-private partnership, as the obstacles to businesses going it alone are very considerable.

When considering public-private partnerships, we then need to ask ourselves: Which are the easiest to implement? Dr Hawkes underscored the importance of selectivity in our approach to agriculture and nutrition. The approach to business and nutrition should be similarly selective. Where do we get the best return from working with business? And where does business get the best return from working with civil society and NGOs? There is a need to be much more nuanced in where we look for opportunities for business involvement; in some contexts the obstacles are probably too great. It is also important to recognize the enormous potential of the informal sector in market-based solutions. In this context we need to think about ways to improve the safety and quality of foods produced.

In conclusion, first, in any value chain approach, it is essential to “keep it simple”. The more one does, the more one comes up against unexpected problems. Food systems are complex and not ever fully understood. This why avoiding the acceptability challenge is paramount. Second, when looking at market-based interventions, it is extremely important to ascertain whether the products in question are truly reaching the poor in ways that benefit their health in the long term. Without that, there is no basis for moving forward with this type of solution.

PANEL RESPONSE

Hanns-Christoph Eiden
President, German Federal Office for Agriculture and Food

Dr Eiden stated that his perspective was that of a civil servant. What is the public sector’s role in agri-food policy? It is limited and decisive at the same time. It is limited because the state is not the only player; it shares the stage with specific interest groups and, above all, consumers. It is decisive because it is in control of regulation and standard setting, and because it is the state’s responsibility to provide public services such as food safety, to provide infrastructure, and to ensure sustainability. It is up to the

state to protect marginalized and vulnerable groups, and to provide a safe environment for investment. It is also up to state to provide incentives for innovative programmes and research, and to ensure reliability as far as traceability, data availability and control and certification schemes are concerned. It is also up to the national authorities to link their own approach to global processes such as the current one.

On the role of agrifood programmes: this need to be based on a solid assessment of the situation, problems and needs. Here again it is a question of how to get nutrition in. These programmes must also be well targeted, and must be concrete and holistic at the same time.

For these programmes to succeed, we need overall goals and concrete actions which must be multisectoral and which are constantly monitored and coordinated. In this respect I would like to address the coherence issue raised in Panel 1: An action plan must be coherent in order to be successful. But coherence is only achieved through discussion. This can be a challenging process and it must be fought for. Action plans must also accept the global realities of urbanization, longer supply chain co-existing with shorter ones, and changing consumer preferences. Tasks must be well defined for all partners. Moreover, we do not need to wait for conclusive evidence. We need to accept that sufficient evidence is good enough to start action.

In conclusion, Dr Eiden posed a question to the floor: Are these also elements for a successful global process, as envisaged by ICN2?

- **Moderator:** Thanked Dr Eiden for highlighting some of the important and complex roles played by government in market-based solutions.

Delia Grace

**Programme Manager for Food Safety and Zoonoses
International Livestock Research Institute**

Dr Grace focused her comments on the food safety aspects of Dr Humphrey's presentation. Food safety is an enormous public health problem. However, unlike some of the other major public health problems – such as malaria and TB – which are starting to go away as the world gets wealthier and healthier, food safety often gets worse as the process of development and industrialization begins. This is due to the nature of complex value chains. And of course, food safety is biologically coupled with nutrition. In nature, you can't separate them, although experts tend to approach them sectorally. For example, in Kenya, where children are weaned onto maize flour and milk, and where high levels of aflatoxin are a problem, it is not helpful to increase the supply of maize and milk, as aflatoxin exposure is increased. (Aflatoxin may also play a role in stunting.) So we can't look at nutrition in "block A" and food safety in "block B". Rather we need to come into the room and talk about them together.

Dr Grace pointed out three paradoxes regarding ILRI's experience in looking at food safety over the last decade.

1. The best is often the worse. The best foods for nutrition – meat, milk, eggs, leafy vegetables – are often the worst for food safety. Meat, which is very good for growing children, is also very good at growing *E. coli* and other bugs. These products are also good for poverty reduction, as the livestock and fish industries provide feasible entry points for low income producers. However, again, they are highly risky from a food safety perspective.

2. The ignored is often the dominant. Eighty to ninety% of high nutrient foods in developing countries is sold via informal markets. As noted by Dr Gomez, these wet markets are where most low income consumers buy high nutrient foods. They are persistent, even in China, Mexico, and other MICs. And several ILRI studies indicate that these markets are actually safer than supermarkets in regards to biological contaminants.
3. The good can be bad. The natural response to improve food safety is regulation. And when it comes to formal markets in rich countries, regulation, combined with high consumer standards has indeed been very good at improving the safety of products. But ILRI's research in wet markets where the poor buy and sell shows that regulation is at best neutral and often deleterious. Dr Grace noted that time did not permit going into the economic reasons for this, but underscored this point's importance in closing.

➤ **Moderator:** Thanked Dr Grace for reminding us of the importance of food safety in the mix of issues.

Gert W. Meijer

Deputy Head of Corporate Regulatory and Scientific Affairs, Nestle International

Dr Meijer addressed some of the comments that were addressed to the private sector during earlier in the meeting. The top twenty largest multinationals in the world count for 10% of the food market. The largest of these multinationals is responsible for 1.7%. If you look at the size and complexity of the malnutrition problem, none of those companies alone will be able to have a significant impact. Collaboration is absolutely necessary if we want to move things forward. That being said, those large multinationals can be instrumental in setting directions for the food industry at large, and this is how we should look at those companies. But this has to be done in alignment with government, NGOs, academics and civil society.

The food industry needs healthy workers. But what is sometimes forgotten is that the food industry also needs healthy consumers, and preferably long-lived ones. This is just good business.

In regards to scientific issues that have been raised:

1. The importance of consumer awareness: a lot of the proposals made in this meeting assume awareness is there. But it is not. Consumer awareness is a big issue. As such, health needs should be translated into "consumer wants". This is very difficult and requires a lot of work in R&D. R&D budgets within industry are always frustratingly small relative to marketing budgets. Moreover 50% effectiveness is considered very good by industry in regards to R&D. So this is a challenge and an area where collaboration is needed, namely in terms of behaviour change.
2. The value chain approach: It is impossible to apply this approach without involving the food industry. And the integration approach - combining food systems, nutrition and agriculture – has been tried within industry, up to the point that we are trying to share some of our findings between partners. For example it is clear that changes made to value chains need to be sustainable and communicable. If those criteria are not met, changes will not have an impact. So the importance of alignment and global collaboration is very important.

In the first session yesterday morning, we were challenged to be bold and creative, and to collaborate. As such, looking at value chains and beyond, I really hope the multinationals will be invited to the 2014

meeting and that agreement can be reached regarding an effective and collaborative programme to combat malnutrition.

- **Moderator:** It is important to note that value chains extend beyond manufacturers and includes retailers. If there are any retailers here it would be good to hear from them.

Christiane Wolff
Agriculture and Commodities Division
WTO

Dr Wolff noted that although the WTO is not historically an organization that thinks much about nutrition, it is on the ICN2 Steering Committee and as a result (along with other factors) the WTO has started to think more on the subject. Dr Wolff then proceeded to cite some aspects of the WTO Framework of Rules, into which the policy options mentioned in Dr Humphrey's paper would eventually fit:

1. Agreement on Technical Barriers to Trade: This agreement applies to all technical regulations, standards and conformity assessment procedures. Nutrition-related policies, such as mandatory fortification requirements or labelling, would be covered by this agreement. Under the Committee for this agreement, members have raised three nutrition-related measures that are currently under development in three low income countries. These measures relate mainly to labelling, but in some case they go beyond labelling. Concerns include transparency to, for example, allow exporters to adapt to the new regulations; the advantages of voluntary versus mandatory labelling schemes (the potential that labels can be misleading and whether the existing international standards have been taken into account); also whether measures are more trade restrictive than necessary or whether they are discriminatory. It is encouraging that all the Committee's speakers – representatives from developed and developing countries – indicated a shared concern regarding the multiple burden of malnutrition. Discussion has centred on identifying policy options which would 1) be least disruptive to trade, while 2) addressing health objectives effectively. Overall, it is important to ensure that policies are non-discriminatory and transparent, both in terms of advance notice and in terms of timeframe for adaptation for implementation.
2. Subsidies: There are agreements in place which aim to ensure that subsidies are applied in the least distorting way possible.
3. Taxes: Again there is a need for non-discriminatory application of tax policy.
4. Food safety: There is the Agreement on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures, and in regards to branding there is an Agreement that deals with intellectual property.

In conclusion, Dr Wolff underscored the need to include those involved in trade in efforts to increase policy coherence, in order to ensure that national trade policies are implemented in a way that avoids conflict. That is, the importance of national, as well as international, consultation.

- **Moderator:** Thanked Dr Wolff for the reminder of international legal obligations that might constrain some of the initiatives under discussion.

Alan Dangour
London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine
Leverhulme Centre for Agriculture and Health

Dr Dangour qualified his commentary as focused on affordability and policy, namely food prices and the evidence around food prices and policies. Dr Dangour posed two questions: First, what is the evidence that food prices change the demand for food (i.e. its affordability)? And second, what is the evidence that agricultural policies which are specifically designed to change the price of food can have an impact on nutrition outcomes?

There is a large body of evidence indicating that the price of food modifies demand for food. This is the bread and butter of development and agricultural economists in regards to price elasticity of demand. Indeed there is so much evidence that it is difficult to know what the message is. At LCIRAH this year, we published a systematic review that looked at the nationally representative evidence on food price elasticities and food prices and the demand for food. For the first time, we looked at these elasticities by wealth category of country and by wealth category of household. It won't surprise this audience that we found that direct food price elasticities are stronger in poor countries for all food groups. In other words, as the price of a particular food rises, demand for that food decreases more for that food in poor countries than in rich countries. Also as expected, we found that within countries, poorer households are much more affected than rich households by food price rises. So food prices are, indeed, a really important determinant of demand for food.

But is it the only determinant? And how much do we really know? These are direct food price elasticities. What about cross-price elasticity and substitution effects? In most countries, there's some level of choice: There's conscious choice, the choice you make because you can make a choice. There's conditioned choice, the choice you make because of things you've been told. And there's constrained choice, choice is constrained in many countries. So what happens in those countries? What happens to the demand for roots and tubers when the price of cereal goes up? If the price of one's main dietary staple goes up, what does one do? Does one find a substitute that is equal in nutritional value, a substitute that is inferior, or does one just eat less? The answer is, we just don't know. And worst of all, the evidence is weakest in poor countries. And of course, price is not the only determinant of food choice. There are multiple other determinants.

So, my second question is: What is the evidence that agricultural policies which are specifically designed to change the price of food can have an impact on nutrition outcomes? Again, LCIRAH recently conducted a systematic review, looking at three different types of agricultural policies that, if designed properly, would, at least conceptually, change the affordability of food for consumers. These were: output price policies; trade liberalization policies; and public distribution systems and food subsidies. So how big do you think the evidence base is that these sorts of agricultural development policies – which are often the main instruments of countries – actually influence nutrition outcomes? It is tiny. Indeed the LCIRAH review only found four studies – including grey literature – that evaluated the impact of these price policies on nutrition outcomes. So the answer to my second question is we just don't know. Conceptually it makes sense: If the policy makes the food more affordable, and if people eat more of that food as a result, then nutrition outcomes will improve. However we do not have robust evidence for this causal chain.

So what should be done? We need to act where it makes sense to do so. We implement policies which make sense conceptually to improve the affordability of food. But critically, we must be much better at

monitoring the impacts. These impacts might be positive or negative. We need to think much more about unintended consequences. For example, citing Dr Pinstруп-Andersen, we need to think more about women's time allocation. There are multiple unintended consequences of agricultural policies that have not been considered sufficiently.

It is also important to be more open to the different forms of evidence which are available. Again, per Dr Pinstруп-Anderson, RCTs can't provide all the evidence. But they can provide some, and these efforts must continue. But it is also necessary to consider other types of evidence, especially from different disciplines. Dr Dangour concluded that despite the academic propensity for more research, within the context of agrifood policies' influence on nutrition, very little is better than nothing, and there should be no further delays to action.

- **Moderator:** Dr Dangour's final point is similar to one made by Dr Eiden: We can't wait until we know everything before doing anything. At some stage we have to say, we know enough to act, even with imperfect information.

COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR, HIGHLIGHTS

Noting the inclusion of a representative from Nestlé on the panel, a speaker citing the challenge posed to nutrition by breast milk substitutes and posed the question: In whose interest would collaboration with the private sector be? The same speaker made a separate point that "we are beyond research". And that the panel would have been more productive if it had focused on how conclusions of research are being applied as specific solutions to problems.

A question directed to Dr Grace inquired as to specific examples of interventions that have attempted to address food safety issues within traditional markets.

In response to Dr Humphrey's call to focus more on informal sector provision of nutrient rich food, the question of "how?" was posed. How is it possible to make governments recognize the informal sector? Many governments see traditional markets as an illegality, not as a force for providing nutrient rich products.

A comment was made in response to Dr Dangour's discussion of consumer behaviour. The speaker underscored the need to distinguish between choices made in ignorance and choices made as the result of informed preferences.

A comment was made regarding the need to create greater diversity and flexibility within programming.

In response to the panel's call for "thinking outside the box", the suggestion was made to set a goal for the post-MDG development agenda specifically for the most impoverished. For example to set a target to reduce stunting not only at national level but also for the lowest wealth quintile. It was argued that this type of goal-setting would facilitate governments and agencies working in a different manner. If made accountable for showing a change in that lowest income quintile, there is a greater likelihood of a shift from "business as usual". The speaker noted that in regards to data, it is possible to have goal setting at the quintile level, the data are there, they just need to be further pulled out and investigated.

PANEL RESPONSE

Dr Humphrey

Dr Humphrey spoke to the importance of the informal sector. He noted that, even in the poorest households, it's usually the case that substantial amounts of food are sourced through informal markets, and that those markets are supplied somehow. Therefore it is necessary to look at ways to improve safety, access, affordability and nutritional quality of the food products in those markets. We know the informal sector is good on price, and that it is pretty good on availability in terms of being close to where people live, and for some products it may not be any worse than the formal sector in terms of safety. But for some foods in the informal sector, there is a big challenge with signalling and nutritional quality. In Ghana, for example, the government promotes informal sector production of weaning formula. If those products are tested, one finds enormous variability within and between brands. As a result the benefits and quality of the product is unpredictable. Could this problem be addressed by providing low income women with packages of nutrients to add to these weaning mixes? Another possibility is franchising. In the health sector, there are franchise systems to improve the quality of advice to poor people. Could a similar model be applied in regards to informal sector food systems and nutrition?

Dr Humphrey also noted that there are examples in Africa of government promotion of informal sector food provision.

Dr Meijer

Dr Meijer made two points regarding collaboration. First, the consumer is the ultimate target of any strategy. Second, in regards to working with the private sector, the challenge of improving agrifood policy and industry performance is extremely complex. Solutions are not easy to come by. We must try to work together and take the chance of collaboration, even if that means the risk of mistakes. FAO and WHO should be applauded for trying to do that here in this meeting. If we do not try to do more of this, we will not be able to address the issues at stake.

Dr Grace

Many of the challenges we are facing today are the result of the solutions of yesterday. This is especially the case with the formal sector, where a combination of lack of evidence (e.g. on the safety of milk or fish) combined with a sort of tunnel vision where the sole focus was food safety, has led to many food supply systems becoming informal, and then illegal, and then running into resulting problems. So for example we now see in many countries that in order for milk to be legally produced, it must be pasteurized and processed in a dairy plant. As a result formal sector milk costs 20 to 30% more than milk produced informally. This removes formal sector milk from the mouths of poor children and also excludes smallholder producers and processors, often women, from benefiting from the dairy sector. The good news is this situation can be remedied. In east Africa, for example, a coalition led by civil society and backed by research was able to demonstrate to policy makers that raw milk is not so dangerous and that producing it and selling it was creating income and livelihoods for millions of voters. Once politicians saw this evidence, they were then able to open the door to raw milk production within the formal sector. In regards to this type of situation, it is important to remember that we mustn't rush into solutions before we have an evidence base. Dr Grace also noted that, due largely to its neglect;

there is enormous room for action within the informal sector. For example, training and incentives packages can really make a difference. The challenge is how to bring these activities to scale.

Dr Eiden

Dr Eiden spoke to the comment on private sector collaboration: Perhaps one lesson learned could be that no matter what the past disputes, and no matter their magnitude, today we know that we need full representation and inclusion of a range of stakeholders. The discussion should be frank and open. But we cannot afford to exclude the private sector or any other partners. Also in regards to the private sector, there is not a single business but rather many businesses. There are many companies all over the world who need to be recognized and strengthened. This debate – regarding inclusion versus exclusion of the private sector – is not one we should be having.

In regards to government responsibility, an important part of responsibility is accept reality. What Dr Grace has said in regards to informal markets is a reality. Including these in government assessments should be a prerequisite. Also, the challenge is to increase data availability, this is primarily a challenge for the international organizations. The challenge of capacity building is also very important, this is true for actors all along food supply chains, including farmers, extension workers and consumers. Good reports which are precise and provide real information on monitoring and other activities are also a challenge to be met. In closing, Dr Eiden noted the importance of sustainable agriculture and fishery systems as a basis for good nutrition.

Dr Dangour

In response to the intervention regarding consumer choices, Dr Dangour noted that the issue of consumer choices is absolutely critical to influencing the nutrition of populations. What happens when purchasing power increases? Do consumers use their extra income to buy bananas or beer? Agriculture and food system policies need to incentivize consumers to spend their increased income on nutritious foods. As such, understanding the drivers of food choice, especially in poor countries and among poor sectors of populations is absolutely important. Unfortunately we do not have enough evidence on this to engage in a policy debate on the subject. Dr Dangour concluded by acknowledging that, as an academic, he is biased towards more research. That said, in this case, more evidence is critically needed.

➤ **Moderator:** A very interesting and exciting panel. Thanks to all.

PANEL 3: SOCIAL POLICIES AND NUTRITION

Presenter: Harold Alderman

Moderator: Michael Samson

Panelists: Stephen Devereux, Leslie Elder, Christina Behrendt, Jimi Adesina, Martin Bloem

Rob Vos

Director, Social Protection Division

Coordinator, Strategic Programme on Rural Poverty Reduction

FAO

Dr Vos explained that although he was not on the panel, he was introducing it given social protection's importance under FAO's revised Strategic Framework. Social protection is a key component in both aspects of FAO's twin track approach to reducing hunger and poverty. First, it helps poor households by

overcoming undernourishment by increasing access to food. Second, it can increase agricultural productivity growth, improve livelihoods and nutrition, and promote social inclusion. These objectives can be met by providing greater income security and insurance to rural households. These types of interventions improve resilience to volatile prices, severe weather events, and other shocks. They prevent fire sales of assets, help maintain dietary quality, and increase the likelihood that children remain in school. In short, the regularity and predictability of social protection instruments smooth income streams to enable households to better manage risk and engage in more profitable livelihoods and agricultural activities. Social protection can also empower women and in so doing, the well-being of families. Rural communities are better off because more resources are invested in local economies.

However, social protection is not a panacea. If the focus is just on access to benefits, these types of interventions may not provide sustainable exit strategies out of poverty and food insecurity. In the case of great adversity – such as the Horn of Africa drought or in situations of high inflation- social benefits may be insufficient. Furthermore, social protection does not address more structural causes of poverty and food insecurity. Addressing these in rural areas requires agricultural and rural development policies which help build greater resilience, improve productivity, and support sustainable resource management.

It is crucial to make connections between social protection policy and agricultural and rural development policy. Doing so is necessary to build a bridge between FAO's twin track approach. For this we need to look at a broad menu of options that is tailored according to context. We need to expand our knowledge of what works best, accounting for different circumstances and capacities across and within countries.

With partners, FAO is a knowledge repository for evidence on the impact of cash transfer programmes (e.g. the "From Protection to Production" project). But we still know very little about how different forms of social protection influence food production investments in agriculture and rural livelihoods in connection with other policies. As such, FAO is working to step up its support to countries incorporating social protection in national strategies, particularly hunger and rural poverty reduction policies; maximize the synergies between social protection and agricultural policies; and incorporate social protection in strategies and actions to increase resilience to shocks. To do so we need to build on the insights of experts such as this panel.

PRESENTATION – SOCIAL POLICIES AND NUTRITION¹¹

Harold Alderman

IFPRI

What gaps in nutrition programmes can be filled by other programmes? Based on the 2013 Lancet Series on Maternal and Child Health, if the ten nutrition-specific interventions known to be effective were scaled up to cover 90% of vulnerable populations, stunting would be reduced by *only* 20%. This is clearly not enough. It is thus the role of nutrition-sensitive interventions to further reduce prevalence rates. There is a wide range of nutrition-sensitive interventions, in addition to agriculture and social protection, there is also education, water and sanitation, and different strategies for empowering women. Collectively, these interventions address the underlying causes of undernutrition.

¹¹ Alderman, H; Mustafa, M (2013) Social Protection and Nutrition. Rome: FAO.

Available at: http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/user_upload/agn/pdf/PTM-ICN2_07_Rev1_Alderman_Full_Paper_2013-11-22.pdf

One of the reasons these interventions are important is their scale. The budgets for agriculture and social protection comprise a large share of governments' total budgets. Another reason is that they are often targeted to the poor. They also provide platforms for nutrition specific interventions, and finally, these agriculture and social protection programmes address the underlying determinant of malnutrition through income growth. So how does social protection in particular affect nutrition (and economic growth)? It:

- reduces poverty
- mitigates fluctuations in income due to shocks
- may enhance the empowerment of women
- increases demand for health and nutrition services
- increases food security.

How have social programmes performed to date through the lens of nutrition? First, social protection programmes tend to target the poor. Incomes may be augmented by as much as 20%. As such they increase food security. What is challenging is moving from there to reductions in undernutrition. What is well-documented is that social protection can increase use of health care. Surprisingly, what is not well-documented is evidence regarding social protection's impact on stunting and underweight. For those programmes which have measured anthropometric outcomes, the impact is very small. That said, of those programmes, the ones that have run longest and have targeted the poorest most accurately are those which have had greatest impact on child growth. A well-targeted programme will have a greater impact than the average programme. In addition, those programmes which have tied a household transfer to child-specific supplements seem to have greater impact.

But why is it that the impact has been modest? First, improved nutrition is usually a tangential goal in social protection programme design. In particular, these programmes are not targeted to the nutritionally vulnerable. Very few transfer programmes are targeted only to families with children under two. Indeed in many cases social protection programmes may not be targeted to populations with high rates of malnutrition at all. Second, increased utilization of health services does not guarantee quality service. Counselling service in particular may be lacking, even in cases where growth monitoring does occur. Finally, many of the studies are just too short to have an impact on stunting.

One of the most prevalent types of social protection is school feeding. Almost every country in the world has some sort of programme for school feeding or take home rations. These are designed predominantly to enhance education. Often they are designed to improve girls' schooling. However even when not targeted, girls are generally more responsive, especially in regards to take home rations. This in turn has implications for nutrition of the next generation. However, in general, school feeding programmes are not designed to address nutrition. Even "home grown" school feeding projects, which serve a number of functions for the community, present problems in terms of nutrition because locally sourced food is more difficult to fortify with micronutrients than foods which are sourced nationally or internationally.

Another perennial problem is cash or in-kind? Due to technological innovation, cash transfer programmes are now much easier to run than ever before. However there are still some situations where in-kind works better, emergencies for example. In-kind transfers are also inflation-proof. That said, it is much cheaper to deliver cash. In the long run, cash transfer programmes seem to be the right

choice. In addition, studies do show that the income received from cash transfers is used to buy food and often to increase dietary diversity.

There is evidence that when cash transfer programmes are combined with nutrition education and behaviour change communication, the impact on dietary diversity is greater than just doing the transfer alone. The complementarity makes the programme more nutrition sensitive.

How can social protection programmes impact women's time allocation? If it's a public works programme, use flexible hours or even, in lieu of physical labour, have participants attend classes, nutrition education or otherwise. In addition, some public works programmes include crèches.

One of the problems of addressing nutrition sensitivity is how to evaluate it? By definition, nutrition is only one among many goals for these types of programmes. Social protection's primary goal is to improve equity. Nutrition can also be addressed but the total gains of the programme are the *sum* of the nutrition gains plus the equity gains plus perhaps the education gains. Otherwise the transfer programme would not be a good investment.

If the programme aims at nutrition sensitivity, it should include the following:

- a clear and specific nutrition objective, so that monitoring and accountability are possible
 - prioritization of nutritionally vulnerable populations
 - a project cycle which is long enough to have a cumulative impact on child growth
 - consideration of women's time constraints along with their cash constraints
 - social mobilization efforts and - in some cases – conditionalities to increase the utilization of health services
 - efforts to coordinate with nutrition specific interventions that are also being implemented
- **Moderator:** This paper shows how far we have come in mapping out the linkages from social protection to improved nutrition to economic growth. Dr Alderman's notes that, malnutrition can be both a cause and an effect of poverty. This creates a vicious circle where poverty worsens malnutrition and malnutrition worsens poverty. However this also presents an opportunity to create a virtuous circle. Dr Alderman's paper and presentation highlighted concrete ways to do this: focusing on young children in the first thousand days, by improving school feeding programmes, through the appropriate design of transfer programmes, through programmes that empower women with both gender sensitive and nutrition sensitive interventions.

Stephen Devereux
Senior Research Fellow, Institute of Development Studies
Director of Centre for Social Protection

Dr Devereux flagged three issues covered in the presentation and paper:

- School feeding: While it is true that nutrition contributes to school performance, the evidence that social protection contributes to either nutrition or school performance is much weaker. We do know that school feeding increases enrolment and attendance, the empirical evidence for improved learning performance is less convincing.
- Cash versus food transfers: The food price crisis of 2008 highlighted the vulnerability of cash transfers to food price volatility. However the key question for this audience is which modality is

more effective in terms of its impacts on nutrition, given the context in question? Several decision tools have been recently devised to help policy makers in making this choice.

- Graduation: Graduating programme beneficiaries has recently become an issue of concern for policy makers and donor agencies, both for cost and affordability reasons and to demonstrate success. However it should be emphasized that graduation is not an option for all beneficiary groups. If one objective of social protection is to protect food and nutrition security, many people will need social assistance on a permanent basis, and they should be entitled to receive it under the fulfilment of the basic human right to adequate food.
- **Moderator:** Is social protection an effective policy instrument for addressing malnutrition? There is little evidence to answer this question definitively. Dr Devereux cited the Ethiopian Productive Safety Net programme, also cited by Dr Alderman, one of the largest social protection programme in sub-Saharan Africa. Although this programme has food security objectives and has had a demonstrated impact on same, there is no evidence that it has improved nutritional outcomes for children. In addition to the reasons cited by Dr Alderman, there are some other possible reasons for this.
 - It may be that nutrition outcomes aren't measured. But if not why not? An important methodological point is the food security is self reported, while anthropometry is one of the few objectively measurable indicators of food security outcomes, so shouldn't it be included in rigorous impact evaluations wherever possible?
 - It may be that programme evaluators and administrators (including development partners) don't want to measure nutrition status, in case they find little evidence of impact, and the programme will be judged a failure, even if it demonstrates positive impact based on other indicators.
 - It may be that social protection should not be expected to improve nutritional status. If we agree that the primary objective of social protection is to protect vulnerable people against down-side risk, then stabilizing food consumption is a core function, but raising food consumption sustainably is arguably more appropriate for poverty reduction and broader development policy.

In response to Dr Alderman's recommendation to include nutrition objectives as an explicit objective of social protection programmes, Dr Devereux cited the limited evidence base and proposed the following question for consideration by the ICN2: Do we agree that nutrition outcomes should be included as key impact indicators for social protection programmes?

Leslie Elder

Health Nutrition and Population, World Bank

Given that we are charged with attempting to address nutrition through multiple sectors, social protection provides an attractive set of interventions and potential impacts. Dr Elder cited Dr Ruel's commentary regarding what can be contributed to nutrition by "business as usual" within agriculture, and noted the same was possible for social protection, including women's empowerment and education, as well as increased income. School feeding provides a good example, given the latest Lancet Series 2013 which highlights the need to address the nutrition needs of adolescent girls well prior to conception. Within this context, school feeding programmes could be tweaked to achieve improved nutrition. If we truly address nutrition education in schools, we can lay the foundations for optimal parenting, optimal infant and young child feeding, for normalizing, for example, the practice of breast feeding.

Dr Elder also mentioned a new World Bank initiative – funded by the Russian Government as current president of the G20 – to add a “web sub site” on nutrition and social protection to the Secure Nutrition website. This repository will expand on and highlight research in this particular area, as it comes forward. Dr Elder closed by noting the potential for south-south sharing on the topic of nutrition and social protection. This is an area considered critical by the newly reorganized Bank.

Christina Behrendt

Social Protection Division, International Labour Organization

Dr Behrendt focused on the concept of social protection floors, which was covered in Dr Alderman’s paper and is one of the concepts that has emerged in the last few years as part of a major social protection paradigm shift. Social protection is now seen as an important investment in human capital that poor countries cannot afford to do without. In a nutshell, the national social protection floor concept was developed by a variety of agencies after the global food price crisis of 2008 to provide an integrated approach to issues of poverty and vulnerability. The idea is to secure both universal access to essential services, and to guarantee social transfers to ensure income and food security.

At the ILO in 2012 a recommendation was adopted around social protection floors which included the following points:

- It is up to countries to determine the floor and to define what constitutes a minimum standard of living.
- For children specifically: An explicit link between income security, access to nutrition, education and care.
- Coordination is essential. Both to address the fragmentation of approaches which often exist at country level. And also because social protection is not a panacea. It will not work if it is not linked to other policy areas.
- The social protection floor concept is rights based approach, linking the right to food with the right to social security with the right to health.

In conclusion, Dr Behrendt acknowledged the issues of governance, financing and institutional capacity, also cited in Dr Alderman’s paper.

Jimi Adesina

Professor and Chair in Social Policy, University of South Africa and Professorial Research Associate at Nordic Africa Research Institute, Uppsala University, Sweden

Dr Adesina identified the need to move out of the social protection discourse and into the social policy discourse. Nutrition and agriculture are two areas where social policy should be addressed ex-ante as opposed to ex-post. Social policy offers preventive measures in order to address ex-ante causes of malnutrition. The idea that we can design policies that focus on the most disadvantaged groups in society – low-income, resource poor, economically marginalized, socially excluded – is problematic. First of all, the most effective interventions against malnutrition are “prophylactic”. Second of all, agricultural support programmes are themselves instruments of social protection. Social protection involves at least five dimensions:

- production
- protection

- redistribution
- social reproduction
- social cohesion and nation building.

If we focus only on a single dimension, our efforts can become counter-productive. For example, focusing only on the ultra poor excludes the “precarious non-poor” who live just above the poverty line.

The heart of what we are dealing with is addressing and changing how the state thinks, and what we understand to be the purpose of the state. There has been dramatic change in both the purpose and the thinking of the state in the last 25 years. In fact a lot of the policy options that have been offered to Africa misrepresent European experience. Massive entitlement failures, for example. As such, for Africa, we have to run where others walk. A number of sessions have focused on intersector cooperation. We cannot deal with these problems through policy silos. No country has built a social policy based on external financing. Economic transformation is required for social transformation. In conclusion, Dr Adesina stated that addressing the widespread entitlement failure that we see across Africa requires mutual embedding or coherence of economic and social policy. We cannot have social policy that is not backed up by pro-poor considerations in regards to economic growth.

Martin Bloem

Senior Nutrition Advisor, Global Coordinator of HIV/AIDS Programme, World Food Programme

Dr Bloem underscored the importance of maternal health to ensure good nutrition outcomes. For example, the need to focus on adolescent girls is an area which has been long ignored. It is still extremely difficult to tackle the issue of maternal health. This is why the connection between nutrition actions and other spaces, or other platforms is so critical. In this regard, Dr Bloem noted WFP’s work with UNICEF and UNFPA on “Health 4+”. The primary challenge to improving maternal health is access to health care. A good example can be found within HIV/AIDs: Within a three year window, one third of people living with HIV/AIDs who were receiving treatment no longer are. Shocks which exacerbate poverty and food and nutrition insecurity are key components of this problem. As such, in addition to tackling the issue of long-term access to treatment, the issues of livelihoods and nutrition must also be addressed. These issues are owned by different departments and different agencies. This is why, when we are talking about effective social protection, we have to engage many platforms, including the problems that come with those platforms.

Dr Bloem also welcomed Dr Devereux’s discussion on school feeding. He noted that while WFP did not originally include a nutrition goal in its school feeding programme, nutrition was now a consideration, not only in terms of improved nutrition but also in terms of the risk of increased overweight and obesity. As such Dr Bloem underscored the importance of a “do no harm” approach in programme design.

- **Moderator:** Noted the comprehensiveness of the panel’s discussion and allotted the rest of the time to interventions from the floor.

COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR, HIGHLIGHTS

A comment was that there was an imbalance between experts from the global north and global south while noting the meeting had achieved a good gender balance during sessions.

An intervention from Madagascar referred to Dr Elder's comments on school feeding, noting that many children come to school on an empty stomach and as such nutrition in schools is important to improving nutrition outcomes. The speaker noted that although there may not be much empirical evidence regarding the impact of nutrition on school performance, it does contribute. The speaker urged provision of fortified food in school as much as possible and noted that, through school feeding programmes, children can also serve as messengers of good nutrition to their households.

There is need to develop national capacity for nutrition, especially in regards to the need for pre-service training.

Dr Ruel responding to Dr Devereux's question of whether nutrition should be a goal for social protection, answered that it should not be, nor should stunting be a prime indicator. Dr Ruel stated that if nutrition is a goal, targeting and interventions must be carefully tailored to specific nutrition objectives.

PANEL RESPONSE

Dr Alderman

Ethiopia's Productive Safety Net Programme (PSNP) was mentioned by himself and by Dr Devereux as an example of social protection policy. That there is no evidence that the PSNP has impacted nutrition does not mean that progress has not been made. Rather it means that it is difficult to attribute where that progress came from. Ethiopia has made sustained reductions in malnutrition. At the same time they've had economic growth, they've revamped health extension services, and they have implemented the afore-mentioned social protection programme. We do not know how each of these contributed. But we do know that nutrition has improved.

There is another point that comes out of this experience: The PSNP is administered by Ethiopia's Food Security Department, which did not want to take on the responsibility of reducing malnutrition. Which brings us to an important question: How do we incentivize the adoption of nutrition objectives? Dr Alderman also offered a caveat regarding the value of school gardens, noting the importance of avoiding child labour in this context as well as the relative inability of most teachers to provide their students with much information regarding horticulture.

Dr Devereux

Agreed with Dr Ruel's intervention on social protection and nutrition, noting that inclusion of the latter depends on a variety of considerations.

Dr Elder

In response to the intervention on school feeding, Dr Elder noted that her intention was to underscore the importance of exploring and exploiting the platform of school feeding to improve nutrition.

Dr Behrendt

In response to Dr Devereux's question, Dr Behrendt agreed that it does not make sense to include nutrition in social protection programmes across the board. However it might make sense to include as an objective in an overall social protection system. Dr Behrendt cautioned against over-

compartmentalizing nutrition, namely in regards to an exclusive focus on the first 1,000 days. She noted the need to ensure that all members of the household have access to good nutrition.

Dr Adesina

Dr Adesina noted the difference between academics and public servants. While the former are required to base their recommendations on evidence, the latter should focus more on the provision of school meals and school feeding programmes as an investment in children's futures.

Dr Bloem

In response to Dr Behrendt's comment on over-compartmentalization, Dr Bloem stated that he considers stunting a human rights and equity issue. Children who are stunted by the time they are two do not have the same opportunities as those who are not. It is precisely because of these broader implications, which extend beyond the individual child to apply to whole countries and indeed to the global context, that we must focus on those critical first 1,000 days.

- **Moderator:** Dr Alderman has made the case that social protection can work to improve nutrition outcomes. This can lead to pro-poor, inclusive economic growth. Dr Devereux and others have raised important scepticisms, but the bottom line is: How can we make social protection more effective in achieving outcomes? As Dr Hawke's said we need to "harness the power of other sectors" as relevant in this context as well. The key is to embed social protection within a broader framework and to work together with other sectors to achieve a complex outcome. Malnutrition is not simple, and as such we cannot expect a single sector to tackle the problem effectively. But social protection is probably a necessary element in most developing countries.

PANEL 4: COHERENCE BETWEEN MEETING DIETARY GOALS AND THE FOOD SUPPLY - ECONOMIC IMPLICATIONS OF CHANGING FOOD PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION PATTERNS

Moderator: David Hallam

Panelists: Per Pinstrup-Andersen, Franco Sassi, Rachel Nugent

David Hallam

Director, Trade and Markets Division

FAO

This panel is to address questions as to the apparent lack of coherence between meeting desirable dietary goals and the current food supply as well as to look at the economic implications of changing food production and consumption patterns. There are two aspects to this issue: First, assuming such coherence is desirable, how do we achieve it? And second, what are the implications of achieving it? What sorts of food systems and consumption patterns would result?

Noting that the composition of this panel was as much about economics as about nutrition, Dr Hallam flagged the following points for consideration:

A number of presentations have concluded that trends in diets seem to be moving away from coherence rather than towards it and for reasons (urbanisation, labour force participation rates, globalization, etc.) not amenable to policy influence (see Traill et al).

Presentations mostly considered the economic benefits of moving towards a healthier diet but did not really explain how to achieve that or how to tailor the food system to provide it. The implicit assumption seemed to be that if consumers demand a healthier diet then through the market the food system will deliver it. There has been little to no discussion of prices and the instruments used to affect prices (e.g. subsidies).

The presentations, again implicitly, put a lot of weight on information/education as a means of shifting consumer behaviour but did not really consider the record of this approach, the costs of competitive advertising, or to come to terms with the observed widespread failure to act on apparent knowledge of better nutrition. Beyond information/education, there was no detailed consideration of how consumers might be persuaded to adopt healthier diets or the policy measures that might encourage this. For example, what is the record on subsidies or taxes? What might the contribution of social protection be?

OECD model-based analysis suggested that the impacts on world markets of a shift to healthier diets would be small. However, this was a one-sided analysis that just looked at the implications of changes on the demand side with supply adjusting according to resulting price movements. However, the commodity coverage of AGLINK is narrow and it could also be argued that the analysis failed to consider the dynamics of dietary change.

The question of how to bring about changes on the supply side was also largely avoided. The presentation described the private and public investment needs in the case of increased fruit and vegetable production and the imbalance in public spending on different commodities. However, it did not explain how shifts in the public spending envelope might be achieved (for example, can fruit and vegetable producers match the lobbying and rent seeking skills of cereals and cotton?). In any case, is rebalancing the envelope just rebalancing distortions?

Overall then, some interesting comments on the implications of better diets but not much analysis of how these might be implemented or how the supply side can be encouraged to adjust. There was no mention of food industry behaviour or how that might be modified or what the trade implications of a healthier food demand might be. This issue is absolutely crucial to the ICN2. Most of these firms are driven by more than short-run profit maximization.

Per Pinstrup-Anderson

Chair of High Level Panel of Experts for the CFS

Professor Emeritus, Charles H. Dyson School of Applied Economics and Management

Division of Nutritional Sciences, Cornell University

Food security means access to food. There is no assumption of utilization. Similarly, nutrition security means that there is access to all the components necessary to assure good nutrition, but again there is no assumption of utilization. As such, food security and nutrition security are opportunities, but whether and how those opportunities are exploited is frequently overlooked.

The most important factors in influencing the acquisition of food and other nutrition related resources can be conceived as beginning with perceived needs, moving to wants and ending with economic

demand. Knowledge and culture are another factor. Also, income level and budget control. And as previously mentioned women's time allocation. These are all crucial to whether the opportunities presented by food and nutrition security are exploited. They can all be influenced by government, civil society and the private sector. This is why we need to work together.

Franco Sassi
Senior Health Economist, OECD

Dr Sassi began by emphasizing the importance of NCDs, including the role played by nutrition in NCD risk factors and the fact that obesity is a global pandemic which has led to production losses worldwide. Dr Sassi cited two bodies of work done by the OECD. The first assessing the impact of a "prevention package" of policy options to address the obesity and NCD epidemics, including cost per capita of implementation in a range of countries, and quantification of health gains. The second modelling how the policy options proposed by the first project would impact global consumption of fat, including projections of how decreased fat consumption would impact prices of beef, cheese and other commodities. Dr Sassi made the following points regarding these two studies:

- Obesity and NCDs are global economic issues
- Food and nutrition policies must be part of a comprehensive intersectoral prevention strategy
- Potential for major health, health expenditure and productivity gains
- The projected limited effects of the proposed policy packages on world markets imply such changes should be economically sustainable over the medium and long term

Rachel Nugent
Director, Disease Control Priorities Network
University of Washington, Department of Global Health

Dr Nugent noted that she had been asked to speak on the "cost of supply side changes for improving the food supply". As such, she made two points : First, the importance of thinking in terms of investments as opposed to costs. Namely, over time, what are the returns, how are they measured, and who benefits? Second, what are the costs of *not* improving the food supply?

For example, what investments are needed for increased fruit and vegetable production? At farm level, a U.S. based farmer would need:

- labour or labour-saving mechanization
- irrigation
- agribusiness services: financing inputs, technical assistance
- small-scale post-harvest storage and processing
- risk management advice

On the societal level, there is a social responsibility to:

- invest in R&D for productivity enhancement
- upgrade traditional markets
- provide crop insurance
- improve market infrastructure: distribution facilities, loans, marketing programmes.

We don't have much of this kind of investment available for fruit and vegetable farming in the U.S. – therefore, it's not a surprise that in the U.S. there are 97 million acres planted in maize, and 240,000 acres planted in green leafy vegetables. The context is further clarified when one compares investments, both in terms of private versus public sector and in terms of maize, livestock and dairy versus produce. The private sector spends millions for certain commodity marketing programs. The Government's 5-a-Day program is also in the millions – tens of millions of \$\$, not hundreds of millions.

However, there is progress here. One example is the marketing of baby carrots ("Baby Carrots: Eat 'Em Like Junk Food"). The creator of that slogan (who used to be with Coca-Cola) told a crowd of more than 1,000 at the Produce Marketing Association convention: "We must change the game. We can help solve the obesity crisis by stealing junk food's playbook, by creating passion for produce, by becoming demand creators, not just growers and processors." The estimate for a major marketing campaign for produce that uses the same techniques as processed foods is \$7 million.

So in response to Dr Pinstrip-Andersen's' question about "getting to how", we have both professional marketing and policy instruments. Factors which influence policies' impact on health include:

- size (adequacy and stability of payments)
- targeting (efficiency and equity)
- elasticities (substitution effects)
- barriers to altering choice set of producers and consumers
- administrative costs
- political acceptability.

However, per Dr Dangour, we still need to do the costing and effectiveness analysis. We simply can't afford not to have this information. Which brings us back to the initial questions: What are the costs of changing the food supply? And what are the returns?

In conclusion, Dr Nugent offered some recommendations to help answer these questions:

- move towards a "do no harm" stance
 - urge transparency in policies (politicians choose inefficient tools if they can be less transparent)
 - use caution when discriminating between heterogeneous producers, as this creates market distortion
 - in the short-run, for health purposes, use nutrition subsidies as opposed to agricultural commodity subsidies
 - in the long-run, we need allocative shifts in the agriculture sector, probably not using a health rationale, perhaps using a development rationale.
- **Moderator:** It would be interesting to delve more into how to engineer these changes. What are the incentives for these changes and how would they be structured?

COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR, HIGHLIGHTS

An intervention was made regarding policy coherence: In the European Union, coherence is a legal requirement. However EU policies are not coherent. As such it seems that non-legal incentives should be considered.

To Dr Nugent: Two reflections were offered regarding marketing of fruits and vegetables. First, working with advertising agencies to reach consumers is extremely expensive. Secondly, we tend to focus on promotion of the product. However, in addition to promoting, good marketing also considers price, product and place. Given these considerations, how can we improve the image of certain foods?

To Dr Sassi: It makes sense that change in the food supply is not going to negatively affect economic opportunity. So why is it not happening? Is it a political economy issue?

PANEL RESPONSE

Dr Nugent

In regards to creative campaigning and how to reach consumers, the “science” of the latter is weak. However social media gives us a lot of new ways to track how information spreads. This is happening as we speak. Social media is potentially much lower cost than conventional techniques. What is intriguing also is that there is a growing interest among advertisers to get into this space. A good way to improve a certain food’s image is to put it in the hands of marketing professionals. Also improving the knowledge of consumers can be helpful.

In response to the question regarding the food supply and economic opportunity: This is an area where context specific analysis is essential. For example, U.S. subsidies are strong. They have been in place a long time. With incentive changes, we will be able to see how far we can go.

- **Moderator:** If you look back at some of the examples of advertising, a lot was done by producer associations and marketing boards. In general the effect was limited because financing was a problem, it was amateurish, and as such there was no way for the public health campaigns to compete with the high powered marketing of the processed foods industry.

Dr Sassi

In response to the comments on advertising, an interesting example is the “Drink Up” water campaign recently launched by the white House and the Partnership for a Healthier America. The market research firm Nielsen is working very closely with this campaign, essentially as a demonstration project. Of course there is an issue of sustainability, as Dr Hallam noted. However if this can be overcome these types of campaigns – a public health message promoted through private sector marketing strategies – have great potential.

Why are changes in the food supply not happening, despite the fact that economic opportunity will likely not be affected? There are many reasons. The main reason is conflicting incentives. For those in our field, we believe that health should be a major driver of policy. However there are many other drivers, and unfortunately in the agricultural sector, the drivers have historically been very different from health. In addition, there are barriers within government and international organizations that deal with government. Dr Nugent’s conclusion – that a health rationale will not succeed in creating the needed allocative shifts within agriculture – is sad but probably true. As such changing sensitivities within government is a pre-requisite for any action to take place. I am insisting on the role of governments because they play a critical role in ensuring that pro-nutrition business opportunities exist for the private sector. A major barrier for example is R&D. R&D is very expensive. As such, governments could ease those barriers. They can also provide subsidies for low-income consumers to encourage increased consumption of certain foods.

- **Moderator:** We are placing a lot of emphasis on persuasion. It is unclear whether the record on persuasion is clear. What are some of the other tools we have at our disposal?

Dr Pinstруп-Andersen

I think we need to look at this challenge from the perspective of households, which are confronted with a range of constraints and objectives. Nutrition is one of those objectives but it may not be the overriding one. Just because a low income, obese consumer overeats doesn't mean that person is irrational. We have to be careful that we don't judge consumers solely on nutrition criteria.

There are a number of issues external to food and agriculture that, if they were dealt with by the public or the private sector, the nutrition sensitivity of food systems would increase. For example, better provision of childcare facilities or reduction or elimination of school fees for low income families.

In regards to the question as to why changes in the food supply are not happening, despite the fact that economic opportunity will likely not be affected: Markets are imperfect, the transmission between consumer and producer in regards to what the consumer might be willing to eat is not high functioning in many of the markets under discussion. And what about risks? As a farmer, am I going to change from the production system which has worked for me for generations to a cash crop with a very high risk? These risks keep farmers and processors from taking advantage of new opportunities. There's a lot of evidence on household behaviour but it hasn't been linked to the current discussion of how the food system can improve nutrition. We need to revisit that literature and link it up to the supply side. It is important to avoid an over-emphasis on the supply side.

- **Moderator:** Dr Hallam closed the Panel and Session by responding to Dr Pinstруп-Andersen's last statement regarding an over-emphasis on the supply side. Dr Hallam disagreed, arguing that there has not been enough said regarding how to engineer shifts on the supply side. What policy instruments exist to achieve this? There is a lot more in this area that we haven't touched on.

DAY 3

SESSION 5

**CONCLUSIONS ON COHERENT POLICIES FOR
NUTRITION-ENHANCING AGRICULTURE AND
FOOD RELATED SYSTEMS, A SUMMARY OF
POLICY ELEMENTS TO BE CONSIDERED BY ICN2,
AND PLANNING THE WAY FORWARD FOR THE
HIGH-LEVEL EVENT 19-21 NOVEMBER 2014**

**Co-Chaired by: Jomo Sundaram (FAO)
Hans Anders Troedsson (WHO)**

SUMMARY

Per Pinstrup Andersen

Chair of High Level Panel of Experts for the CFS

Professor Emeritus

Charles H. Dyson School of Applied Economics and Management

Division of Nutritional Sciences

Cornell University

I am just going to hit on a few highlights from the summary and add my own biases.

First, it's very clear that a lot of new and synthesized evidence has been brought to bear on the topic of this meeting. Partly from the presentations and the discussions, but also as Mr Sundaram has mentioned, from the reports of the regional meetings and from all of the background papers and materials that have been prepared for this meeting.

We had a very rich discussion much of which has been more at the conceptual level. I think what is needed now is to take all this conceptual knowledge that we have brought together and bring it down to the field level. We need to convert all of the rhetoric into action in a practical way that will benefit low-income people, malnourished people, particularly those in developing countries. This is not a criticism because we need to do our homework before we get into the field with specific initiatives, but on the other hand let us not wait another ten years while we are doing more research. The problem is urgent and we need to act now, we need to take risks. We may get it wrong. Governments may get it wrong, private sector, NGOs may get it wrong. That's part of doing something. Then we back off and try again. I realize it is easy for me to say because I am not involved in actually taking those risks. But I think it really is important that we now move from the talking stage to taking action. While continuing research, because there is a lot more knowledge that we can benefit from, we need to do the two things in parallel. As we move ahead let's keep in mind that much of what we want to do has a gender specific angle to it. I have talked in the last two days about women's time demands, time famine if you like. But there are many other gender specific issues that we need to keep in mind as we begin to turn this conceptual knowledge into action at the field level.

Let us also keep in mind that what we need to do is multisectoral and multidisciplinary. And many of us are not very good at making multidisciplinary things happen. We need to help people who are going to implement these initiatives to actually work together across sectors and across disciplines. That is true at governmental level, it is true at local level and it is true at the international level.

I would like to mention that if we fail to take into account the sustainability issues that have been identified, including by the food security and sustainability workshop that was held prior to this Meeting, as we proceed to make agriculture and food systems more nutrition-sensitive or nutrition-enhancing, we are missing the point. We really have to look at sustainability; we have to recognize that human health and ecological health go together. If we fail on the sustainability side we may make be successful in the short run but not in the long run.

Let me now talk about some of the highlights from this Meeting. We started the meeting talking about trends in the nutrition situation and were told that dietary energy deficiencies have reduced. We have made progress. We were told that we are producing more calories per person than we were in 1992.

But we still have a big problem as there are still a lot of people - we don't know how many, it may be 800 million, it may be some other number – but a lot of people are still short on dietary energy. We were also told that micronutrient deficiencies in terms of prevalence have stayed roughly constant since 1992, which means that the number of people who are deficient in one or more micronutrients, that number has apparently gone up. So has the number of overweight, obese people and people who suffer from chronic diseases resulting from overweight and obesity. That trend is upwards and it is moving rapidly.

We talked about the diet transition, we talked about the increase in diet diversity, and we talked about the potential contradiction between the improvement in the consumption of animal source protein and fruits and vegetables on the one hand, and very little improvement in the micronutrient situation on the other. This may be due to one of two things – and this is my own personal speculation: either the data are not very good, we think maybe a couple of billion people are short on some micronutrient; do we really know? I don't believe we do. So it could be that the data are simply not strong enough to pick up whatever trends may be there. The other possible explanation for having improved diet diversity but apparently not improved micronutrient situations may be that the diet transition is affecting primarily those people who are not deficient in the first place. I don't really believe that hypothesis but it is certainly worth taking another look at. Who in fact benefited from this diet transition?

We were also told that there is a rapidly increasing trend in the consumption of processed food. We were told that the intake of sugar, sweeteners, trans fat and salt is going up as well and even though I am not a nutritionist I know that's not a good thing. We were told that the supply chains are getting longer. I guess that's no big surprise, we knew that. But it seems to be the case in almost every country that we can think of. Of course it depends on the context. If you are a semi-subsistence farmer you may still confront a very short supply chain. But then again, you may be buying food that comes from a fairly long supply chain. So we can't really make a sharp distinction between low-income rural people and low-income urban people in the sense of one having a larger supply chain or value chain than the other.

I think there was general agreement in the meeting that changes in the value chain offer tremendous opportunities for improving nutrition. What we didn't seem to get a handle on was whose responsibility is it? Yes I think we agreed that we want collaboration among the public sector, the private sector and civil society. I didn't hear any disagreement on that. There was some disagreement as to whether we could trust the private sector. I am pretty sure we can. The private sector is not in the business to do us harm, they are in the business to achieve their goals and again. Coming back to what I was saying yesterday, we need to look for win-wins so that the goals currently driving the system can be made compatible with the goals of improving nutrition.

What we didn't come to grips with was who does what. What is a public good that requires government intervention in order to improve the value chain? What is a private good that requires intervention by the private sector or by civil society? And what kind of regulations and incentives are needed in order to make those changes happen?

What about consumer behaviour. Does the consumer really put as much value on improved nutrition as we may do in this particular meeting? Or is there a need for better understanding of consumer behaviour? I believe there is. And again as I said earlier I don't think we should put everything on hold while we figure out how to get more information about consumer behaviour, these things have to go simultaneously. But I think there is a need to look at consumer behaviour in a broader context. Not just from the perspective of nutrition but from the perspective of what else does the consuming household

have to deal with. And I am of course talking about those consuming households that have malnourished members. They have to deal with a number of other things. We need to look at the broader context if we are to understand how to improve the nutrition enhancement of value chains.

We've been told we need more work on metrics, on indicators. We were told that we should probably not limit the indicator to stunting as we try to understand and evaluate how agricultural and food systems can improve nutrition. We need to look at intermediate pathway variables. It could be diet diversity; it could be a number of other things. The point was made that we need more research on this and certainly we do, but again I think we probably have enough knowledge to move ahead and yes possibly make some mistakes along the way. But the more we talk about these things the more convinced I become that diet diversity is so extremely important if we are to improve nutrition and not just increase dietary intake. This is not a new idea that I suddenly got, this has been discussed a lot, but I think we need to put much more emphasis on that. So reducing stunting may be the ultimate goal and I think it probably should be the ultimate goal, but it may not be the indicator that is feasible to use as we begin to improve the food and agricultural system. We need to find proxies and again we need to understand which proxies are most likely to indicate impact on the ultimate variable, the ultimate goal, namely improving people's welfare, whether in this case I am talking about stunting of children or adults who suffer from malnutrition as well, including of course obesity and micronutrient deficiency. In fact, we see an increasing number of individuals who suffer from both. They are obese and they are micronutrient deficient.

That introduces a very difficult issue for policy makers. How do you deal with that? And you add to that the fact that many countries have high levels of undernutrition as well as of obesity. I had a graduate student a few years ago who was trying to look at whether there was one policy that could deal with both of these issues in China and of course he concluded what should have been obvious: there isn't one policy that will deal with both over and under nutrition, you have to put together a package of policies to deal with these things.

I was very, very interested in the country reports in the afternoon of the first day. What we were told is: There's a lot going on. While we are talking there's a tremendous amount going on in the field. David Nabarro who was chairing the session concluded with something like "this is pure joy" that there was actually a lot going on. There are many new and innovative initiatives that were reported in that afternoon: the SUN effort seems to be working really well in a number of countries and multisectoral plans are being implemented at local levels. There are institutional differences we were told. But many of the plans have not been implemented. We still have a lot of work to do in turning those plans into action in many countries. And when I say we I am of course in this case talking about government in the particular countries. We also heard from CAADP and from UNICEF about the work they are doing. More details on the country reports will be made available to you.

Let me return now to the conceptual discussion and go to the second day. I think what we generally agreed was there are quite strong opportunities for enhancing the nutrition impact of food and agricultural systems, whether we are talking about small projects, e.g. kitchen garden projects or whether we are talking about large policies. And the question was asked: If everyone stands to benefit from doing this, why hasn't it happened already? And of course the answer is not everyone stands to benefit from these kinds of changes. We are living in a world where policies and programmes are guided by a combination of stakeholder groups, some of which have more power than others. And those that are most powerful presumably are more likely to stick with what they can benefit from. These are what economists call political economy issues; we need to understand the policy process a lot better. In

addition to this, other constraints are institutional: the institutions are simply not there in order to facilitate the kind of multisectoral action that would change food and agricultural systems for the benefit of nutrition. In addition, there are other goals that may override nutritional goals which is why I want to come back to my point regarding multiple wins: we need to integrate nutrition goals into other goals that currently drive the system so that the two are compatible. If we can't do that I don't think nutrition goals are going to win out. The lobby groups for improved nutrition are not as strong as some of the other lobby groups.

And then there is the behavioral question: Do consumer groups really value improved nutrition over other goals that they may have, given time and money constraints? The last point that may explain why this hasn't happened is that there is a risk associated with doing new things. If I am a farmer and I am producing rice or maize or something else that my grandfather and father also produced, do I really want to take the risk of moving towards the production of broccoli or kale or something else. This is risky business and there may be a role for government here in helping to manage risks associated with the dietary transition.

We talked about pathways, availability, access, food security, we talked about behaviour. The point came up several times that countries need to invest much more in infrastructure. One of the points made was that we have surplus production in one location of a country and people are starving in another place while the surplus is rotting, because the infrastructure is not there, the roads are not there, the institutions are not there, the farmer associations are not there. So there is again the need for the public and the private sectors to improve the rural infrastructure.

I think there was general agreement that we need diversity not only in consumption as already mentioned but in production. This sends a strong message to the agricultural research community to perhaps reallocate resources away from the three basic grains towards a more diverse portfolio of food crops. Now this doesn't mean we should stop doing research on rice, wheat and maize. Absolutely not. It's a question of relative allocation. This also goes for government subsidy programmes and similar things. Maybe there is a need to really worry about producing more nutrient s rather than more quantity of food. Now in some cases there's no conflict between the two but in other cases there actually is. My suggestion – perhaps it is just my bias but I think it did come up in a number of discussions – is that we need to focus much more on nutrient production rather than just looking at the quantity per unit of resource.

There was a short discussion of local self reliance and I'm raising that because I think it's important that we understand that a lot of the action that we are asking for will happen at the community and household level. There is a need to better understand how governments, private sector and civil society can promote this type of action at local level.

We agreed in the session on value chains that there are tremendous opportunities for nutrition gains through changes in the value chain. The unresolved question again is: What's the role of the public sector versus the private sector versus civil society? We need to again understand consumer behaviour in order to achieve those gains.

A lot of this is context specific and we certainly can't sit here and develop a recipe for the whole world. But we can help with frameworks so that in fact those local solutions can be developed. We talked about fortification, whether it's biofortification or industrial fortification. There was a point raised that it's fine to talk about food security but we need to talk about food safety as well. What's the point of

having access to lots of food if it makes you sick? One of the points that came up in this discussion was the tradeoff between the degree of food safety and the cost of the food which is translated into food security. Do we really expect all poor people in the world to have the same food safety standards as the EU currently has? If we do then the cost of foods that are available in local markets in developing countries will go up quite a lot. That doesn't mean that poor people should eat dirty food. It is a matter of relative standards. Higher income people require standards that may be so high they add very little to food safety.

The question came up about the role of the private sector and I would like to add to that the role of civil society, because I think that we do have to work together. We can criticize each other and we should, but in the final analysis the public sector, the private sector and civil society have to work together because all three are key players in this business and we can't get this problem solved if one of the three major players is left out. Remember that farmers are in the private sector, and remember also that consumers are extremely important, whether their interests are being reflected in civil society or in some other way.

We talked about social protection and were told that nutrition might not be a major goal in most social protection programmes, but it could be, and I believe the recommendation was made by the presenter that probably more explicit consideration should be given to nutrition in future social protection programmes.

We talked about compatibility and coherence between efforts to change food and agricultural systems and efforts to change consumer behaviour. However I think I already covered that. But the issue here is who is really driving the food system? Is it the consumer? Is it the farmer? Is it the food processing industry? Is it the government? I suspect the answer is first context specific and second all of the above. But the question is who do we need to interact with in order to make the changes that would make these systems more nutrition enhancing?

We talked about targeting and vulnerable populations, the point was made that some of these people were made vulnerable by existing institutions and power structures. However I think there was general agreement that what we are talking about was to focus changes in the food and agricultural system towards improvements in the lives of vulnerable people with specific emphasis on nutrition.

In conclusion I would like to make five recommendations that were actually developed prior to this meeting and re-affirmed at this meeting:

1. Continue building a common vision for nutrition at all levels. I have no doubts that – if not explicitly – at least implicitly that is what we have been saying over the last two days.
2. Build institutional capacity and promote effective coordination across sectors. Again I think this is exactly what we have been talking about.
3. Better data for better policy making. We need better matrices.
4. We need to focus on improving value chains for the benefit of nutrition.
5. Align nutrition objectives with agriculture and food system goals. We need to integrate those goals so that what is currently driving the system is changed to accommodate nutrition goals.

Let me end, Mr Chairman, by saying - and I think I already mentioned this in some way – we did not develop a recipe for how to enhance nutrition through changes in the food and agricultural system. We were not supposed to, and we didn't and I don't think we can at the international level, these things are

context specific. I think what we did do is identify a number of steps to be taken at the national and local level. We suggested that experimentation should take place at the national and local level, and that different approaches will develop. I would argue that we need to put a lot of emphasis on policy. Yes, small scale projects are important at the local level, but big changes in policy can ruin everything at the local level, so we need to understand how these big policies, policies with a widespread impact can be changed. Let me finish by suggesting that what comes out of this meeting will hopefully be reviewed by member countries and hopefully will get a response by member countries. That is something that my colleagues to my right will deal with. But I think it is very important that we get buy-in and if not, that we are told where we went wrong. Let me thank you for your attention and I will end here. Thank you.

COMMENTS FROM CO- CHAIR DR SUNDARAM

Mr Sundaram acknowledged the need for the technical information shared during this meeting to feed effectively into the intergovernmental process that is to follow. Mr Sundaram underscored the first of Mr Pinstrip-Anderson's five concluding points by noting that while development of a common vision is critical to ensure and enhance international cooperation and solidarity around nutrition issues, and in so doing help make nutrition a priority on international agendas, it is equally critical to recognize that nutrition solutions are highly context specific, and that there is no single "one-size fits all" solution.

Mr Sundaram noted:

1. There has been only modest progress in reducing the percentage as well as the absolute number of people who are deemed hungry, according to FAO's Prevalence of Undernourishment (PoU) estimate. As such, although target 1C of the MDGs may be achieved, the 1996 World Summit Goal (halve the proportion of hungry people) remains out of reach. The problem is not supply, but access. It was noted that the FAO indicator is minimalist because of its very strict eligibility criteria and because it does not assess micronutrient intake, the implication being that the PoU estimate is subject to errors of exclusion given that hunger can occur seasonally and in a variety of permutations.
2. The challenge of tracking and addressing micronutrient deficiencies. There are very few indicators for these deficiencies, especially in regards to global information. Most countries estimate prevalence rates based on survey data.
3. The growing prevalence of obesity, which is not just a rich country phenomenon.

COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR, ROUND 1

The International Collective in Support of Fishworkers

Presented the case for small-scale fisheries' contribution to the right to adequate food. Detailed the strategic importance of promoting fish consumption in national nutritional policies as an affordable source of micronutrients, fatty acids, and protein. Cited the need for investments in infrastructure and waste reduction efforts. Made reference to the pending Voluntary Guidelines for Sustainable Small-Scale Fisheries and to the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fishing. These guidelines combine an ecosystems approach with one based on human rights, they also include an emphasis on nutrition. It is hoped that both these guidelines will be adopted in June 2014 by the FAO Committee on Fisheries and that they will become a standard reference for policymakers aiming to increase the nutrition sensitivity of food systems.

FIAN International

Emphasized the need to include a human rights paradigm in preparations for the 2014 Conference. Called for acknowledgement of the role played by agro-industry in displacement of vulnerable populations, destruction of biodiversity, land grabbing and other problems. Argued these issues had been downplayed in the meeting.

ISPC/CGIAR

Commended Mr Pinstруп-Andersen's summary and recommendations for consideration by the ICN2. He highlighted the 5th recommendation - the need to continue aligning nutrition with goals for agriculture and food systems – as relevant to the CGIAR's recent adoption of a new higher level objective for human nutrition and health. He noted that the ISPC had recently convened a Science Forum with BMZ entitled *Nutrition and Health Outcomes: Targets for agricultural research* which took place in September 2013, in Bonn. The meeting summary and outcomes were noted as available at:

www.scienceforum13.org and www.sciencecouncil.cgiar.org. The speaker described the forum's objective to use recent evidence across a range of disciplines to identify priority research needs, new scientific approaches and facilitate new and stronger partnerships through which the agricultural community can add value to the delivery of nutrition and health outcomes. He noted that part of the motivation for the meeting was to question recent scientific literature on the impacts of agricultural research on improving nutrition. He also noted that the meeting confirmed the importance of agricultural research contributing to better nutrition and health outcomes and highlighted several issues relevant to the current ICN2 debate, namely:

1. Research towards nutrition outcomes needs to be specific and distinguished from food security.
2. Agriculture can assist and needs to be part of the public health dialogue – however there needs to be clarity and honesty about what agriculture can realistically contribute.
3. Governments and the research community need to consider diet as a whole as there may have been too much emphasis on micronutrients as one by one deliverables. This does not undermine the necessary experimentation that the CGIAR is conducting on the biofortification of staple crops through the Harvest Plus programme, but rather calls for additional effort on whole diet approaches.
4. Agriculture can contribute to diet diversity (cost reduction), diet quality and food safety programmes which need to be measured by appropriate and more proximal indicators than stunting.
5. The importance of women is increasingly recognised in effective approaches and delivery (household decision-making, labour, caring, the 1000 days paradigm) - but it is still necessary to bear in mind the needs and targets of whole households for achieving better nutrition.
6. Need to recognise that farms and the food system are businesses and to seek appropriate public-private partnerships (PPPs) for research and delivery (inputs, value chains and products to the plate).
7. Agriculture has a role to play in relation to nutrition, education and social support programmes – sectors need to be coordinated and work together to deliver nutrition outcomes.
8. Recognise the importance of qualitative approaches to increase understanding of linkages.
9. There may be new research to conduct at the articulation between fields – we must look for, and report, evidence (appropriate evaluation methods).
10. Examples of innovative approaches that were suggested include breeding goals for nutritional traits in crop enhancement; social network analysis for policy and institutional issues; applying genomics and bioinformatics to food safety issues.

Concluded by stating that ISPC strongly supports the inclusion of agriculture and agricultural research as a key component of improving the nutrition of the poor, in tandem with policy discussions on how to improve the coordination of sectoral approaches and the development of appropriate PPPs.

IDS

Reiterated the point made by Mr Pinstруп-Andersen regarding Panel 3's conclusions on social protection that nutrition is not always a direct objective of social protection programmes, but probably should be. Recommended improvements in nutrition status should not necessarily be a key impact indicator for each and every social protection programme, but social protection definitely needs to be an integral component of any integrated and systematic approach to reducing malnutrition.

Zimbabwe

While recognizing the Preparatory Technical Meeting had been a good beginning, pointed out the Expert Panels could have been more globally representative, with different voices coming from different parts of the world, to build greater global consensus on a common vision. The important contribution of the regional consultations in reaching such a consensus was highlighted. Recognized that if the meeting's final outcome is to be relevant to all regions, global action is required and "If we are going to have global action, we must have a global understanding of the challenges and opportunities".

- Mr Sundaram acknowledged the desirability of having greater geographic and gender diversity on the expert panels but pointed out we had done our best to achieve this considering the limited resources we had available.

Finland

Commended the meeting and Dr Pinstруп-Andersen's summary. Voiced support for the previous statement made by Zimbabwe regarding the need for a common vision. Requested clarification on the purpose of this session. In regards to the preparatory process for the 2014 ICN2 Conference, Finland would like to see more emphasis on political commitment and political coherence.

- Mr Sundaram clarified the purpose of this session was to generate a common vision that is well informed, building upon the discussions over the first two days. Mr Sundaram noted that a common vision is important to inform the intergovernmental processes which Finland referred to, moving forward from the Preparatory Technical Meeting.

Malawi

Emphasized that the side-event on sustainability that took place on Tuesday, 12 November was of major importance; in particular the development of policies oriented to sustainability, and that further discussion on this is needed. Considered that much of the discussions had been on developed countries, and that there was a need to focus more on developing countries. Called for malnutrition to be addressed in a sustainable way and for the ICN2 to provide guidance on the development of policies in developing countries in order to more sustainably fight malnutrition. We need to systematically address the connection between climate change and nutrition, adding that issues of climate change and nutrition are linked, noting that agriculture can contribute to nutrition and climate change mitigation.

Italy

Endorsed Zimbabwe's comments on the preparatory process for the ICN2, noting that although there had been broad participation from qualified experts, not all Member States had been well represented. Considered it essential to consider the outcomes of the Regional preparatory workshops in the final report.

United States of America

Called for the ICN2 to be combined with other international efforts such as the SUN Movement and the post 2015 MDGs. Argued that the goals of the preparatory meeting - to review the state of the art on the malnutrition problem and get to know country experiences – had only been partially met. Contributions to advances in nutrition made by UN agencies had been presented, but there should have been greater representation from Member Countries. In particular noted the absence of adequate representation from Latin America and Africa, citing a lack of reporting on DHS, MICs, food consumption surveys, and HHCE surveys. The data presented were incomplete, with a lack of discussion on the risks of intake of certain vitamins and mineral (e.g. vitamin A and iodine). Acknowledged dietary diversity is essential, but argued that other issues such as micronutrient supplementation and biofortification, also need to be considered. Concluded that the meeting had been a missed opportunity for sharing lessons learned.

- Mr Sundaram acknowledged the USA had provided fair criticism but questioned whether the intervention constituted a fair assessment of the process. Mr Sundaram indicated that on Wednesday, 13 November, WHO had presented the report “Global nutrition policy review: What does it take to scale up nutrition action” on the progress made by countries with regard to nutrition policies since 1992, and that the second session on Wednesday had been on country experiences. Mr Sundaram cited the many inputs that had been provided and considered prior to the meeting, and noted that the meeting's goal was to provide a sound technical base to inform the preparatory process for the 2014 Conference. Accepted that there had not been enough time to present all the work done, and invited participants to refer to the relevant websites.
- Mr Sundaram concluded by pointing out there had been no intention of preparing a declaration document and that the intergovernmental process in the year ahead would allow greater involvement and contributions from Members in the ICN2 process.

Brazil

Acknowledged that nutrition is a complex issue that cannot be tackled without the involvement of many sectors. Three lessons learned were presented for consideration during the run up to the 2014 Conference:

1. Social policies play a central role in promoting nutrition: public health policies, targeting the vulnerable, are crucial to prevent stunting and NCDs; and social safety nets can have the dual effect of reducing poverty and improving nutrition. Brazil's social protection programmes were cited as examples of how social protection policy can help improve nutrition outcomes.
2. The importance of the full realization of the Human Right to Food. Realizing this goal requires a holistic, people-centred approach that is sustainable, responsible to the environment and looks at the whole food chain and not only to the end consumer.
3. Address the important relationship between nutrition and biodiversity; and the contribution of biodiversity to food security. The contribution of biodiversity to nutrition has been undervalued

and has a high potential. Currently only 4 species account for 60% of all industrialized food products.

Germany

Expressed appreciation for the preparatory meeting and the many different and important topics that had been discussed. Main points from the German perspective are as follows:

1. Ensuring adequate nutrition for all people at all times is a fundamental challenge to every society of our time. Nutrition is a human rights issue.
2. Adequate nutrition can only be achieved through a multisectoral approach (e.g. health, education, agriculture, social development and environment). Approaches should be country specific and inclusive.
3. The prevention of malnutrition, lack of physical activity and related diseases as well as a sustainable, bio-based economy are core issues on the political agenda in Germany. Germany is committed to ecologically, economically and socially sustainable approaches to meet the challenges for our future.
4. Germany urges FAO and WHO to follow up on this meeting, drawing up conclusions and actions to be taken. The ICN2 should be used as a platform for placing nutrition on the 2015 development agenda.
5. The intergovernmental process leading up to the 2014 Conference must be open, inclusive and participatory. It must include civil society, the public sector, science and the UN-system. We need to take all capacities available on board. We need to communicate and to build a common understanding.

Argentina

Commended the meeting while acknowledging limitations “already mentioned”. Noted that the presentations and subsequent discussions had been very interesting. Argentina had participated in the first ICN and that its conclusions had served as a real encouragement to reorient food and nutrition policies in the country. At that time, Argentina’s main nutritional problem had been overweight and obesity from a young age and high mortality from non-communicable diseases associated with an unhealthy diet and low physical activity. Actions have been implemented in the country as part of the Argentina Healthy Plan and the National Plan for Food Security in 2003. Argentina is also working in the *Mercosur* for greater effectiveness. But all this is not enough. Argentina considers the ICN2 useful and necessary. Topics supported by Argentina for inclusion in the ICN2 are breastfeeding and the International Code of Marketing of Breast-milk Substitutes, and guidelines for a code on advertising and food marketing aimed at children, as indicated in separate publications from the Regional Offices of the Americas and the World Health Organization. Concluded by stating that Argentina is ready and willing to contribute to the ICN2 initiative.

France

Noted the ICN2 is a unique opportunity to tackle nutrition as a whole, argued that poor nutrition is present in a majority of countries given changes in lifestyle and that it is important to seize the opportunity to work on implementing adequate policies. Noted the importance of consolidating research and data gathering for better insights into the nutrition situation in both north and south. Suggested that during the preparatory process leading to the ICN2, the shortcomings of the first ICN and the lack of follow-up on engagements should be analyzed. The ICN2 should be based on an intergovernmental process, and that in addition to FAO and WHO, the preparatory process will bring

other actors on board to work together. Concluded by asking the organizers to consider, consolidate and take on board the findings and conclusions of important meetings on related topics in the recent past as well as the preparatory work directly supporting the ICN2.

Spain

Called for greater coherence and connection between the ICN2 and the post-2015 agenda. There should be more focus on the type of development that people want, on the type of world we want. A focus on the lack of equity is needed. The point of view of agriculture is also important.

Russia

Emphasized the important role of education and communication and noted the need for this issue to be included in the global priorities of the ICN2.

- Mr Sundaram noted that Russia has been leading the G20 process over the last year and will be leading the G8 process next year, and has been playing an important role in this area.

Uganda

Agreed with Zimbabwe's comments as a reflection of the African position, and noted the importance of including initiatives from all parts of the world in the discussions. Recognized the need to listen to regional bodies such as CAADP as these organizations provide important regional perspectives. Expressed the need for ICN2 issues to be discussed in the 2014 FAO Regional Conferences and for these discussions to feed back into the ICN2 process. In particular noted the importance of having the regional conferences review options for an intergovernmental mechanism to ensure their views inform the planning process. Concluded by stressing the importance of policy coherence, especially at the regional level.

Sierra Leone

Acknowledged the importance of policy formulation but argued that implementation was crucial: It is "good to have all the policies but if we don't implement them we are not going to go anywhere; we need to put policies into actions." Noted that human resource development is important, and since most implementation done at service delivery level is done by health workers, the need to include practical nutrition interventions in pre-service training of health workers is crucial. Noted that empowerment of communities is also needed: "we first need to listen and observe before we dialogue". At national level, emphasis was placed on the need for political will and financial commitment in order to implement, "If this is not done, we will be here in 10 years time talking about the same issues." Also noted the need for the ICN2 to pay explicit attention to scaling up breastfeeding, complementary feeding and growth monitoring.

COMMENTS FROM CO-CHAIR DR TROEDSSON

Dr Troedsson noted that there are two related dimensions of the ICN2, technical knowledge and political commitment. The first informs the second. While there is a research agenda and technical knowledge informing interventions, what has not been seen sufficiently is impact. Acknowledged that the current nutrition agenda is broader than it was 22 years ago, asked how, from the perspective of both technical interventions and political commitment, can the unfinished agenda of undernutrition, ongoing micronutrient deficiencies, as well as the new emerging epidemic of NCDs that are rooted in nutrition, be addressed? In other words, what do we need to get out of the INC2 and how to we get it?

1. Formulate a common vision. To date this does not appear to be happening with different sectors –e.g. between public health, agriculture and food systems – there has to be a common vision.
2. Better understand how to act upon existing knowledge to achieve impact.
3. Improve alignment or coherence of nutrition within food systems, agriculture and health.
4. Provide justifications, both technical and political, for adequate resource allocation for nutrition.

Dr Troedsson concluded by noting that neither the preparatory meeting nor the 2014 Conference would accomplish all of these objectives by themselves. As such, and reinforcing the point made by a number of speakers, that it is essential to align with other initiatives in order to maximize impact, “No meeting alone can accomplish these objectives; they all need to feed into each other”.

COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR, ROUND 2

Norway

Complimented FAO and WHO on a scientifically rich and informative technical meeting, noting that it had succeeded in highlighting key nutrition issues and their urgency. Noted that the nutrition debate is gaining momentum and the subsequent need to move rapidly on these issues, and offered the following recommendations:

1. To be successful the ICN2 should take into account country experiences and initiatives where nutrition has been placed at the top of the political agenda, with multisectoral involvement.
2. ICN2 should build on and feed into ongoing nutrition processes such as SUN, REACH, G8, etc. as well as participating in the 2015 MDG and sustainable development goals negotiations.
3. The ICN2 should report its findings to the Secretary General or the ECOSOC at the close of its deliberations. As such, the FAO and WHO should use the Steering Committee created with other global stakeholders for ICN2 to inform preparations, seek guidance, and share results. Regional organizations must be included in this outreach effort.
4. An inclusive process that involves all stakeholders – private sector, civil society, government, and academia – is required. Although each stakeholder plays a different role– sometimes conflicting – we must work together to move the agenda forward. A transparent consultative process should be established, based on terms of reference and common understanding.
5. Norway looks forward to the report from this meeting, which, with findings from the regional consultations, will be the basis for deciding how to take this process forward.
6. Budget and funds need to be clarified.

7. Issues flagged by Norway as important topics for the 2014 Conference are: the right to food and breastfeeding; challenges posed by climate change; and the contribution of fish to nutrition.
8. The ICN2 Secretariat should provide information regarding how country contributions already made to the preparatory process will be used.

Italy

Expressed appreciation to FAO and WHO for having convened this technical meeting. Reiterated their statement made earlier in the session, that in the last two years several preparatory meetings have taken place in the regions and their outcomes ought to be included in the final report. Expressed gratitude to the panellists and to the delegations for their valuable contributions to the debate, noting in particular Dr Pinstруп-Andersen's "exhaustive summary" which Italy endorsed and had no further comments thereupon.

Focus was given to how best to build a platform for a successful intergovernmental process? Italy expects a firm political commitment as an outcome from the ICN2 with clear cut targets and indicators. Ensuring food security, adequate nutrition and sustainable food systems is a global, multifaceted challenge that the international community, with no distinction among countries, must address. A multi-sector and inclusive approach is therefore required, with the involvement of civil society and the private sector. Noted that problems related to nutrition, in all its aspects and forms, are cross-cutting and related as well to patterns of production and consumption that need to be reconsidered.

In regards to policy coherence, noted a growing awareness in Italy that solutions require joint efforts and coordinated and coherent policies. As reported in Session 2, Italy is taking action on several fronts such as health, nutrition, agriculture, education and international development cooperation through programmes implemented in an increasingly coordinated way by different Italian Ministries. Recognizing we cannot limit ourselves to the domestic level, and as highlighted by several delegates, we need to do more in terms of international cooperation, saying "There will be no solution without a joint and coordinated effort, pooling resources to achieve common goals on the basis of a shared vision and methodology." Reaffirmed Italy's commitment to work in this direction, citing support of rural development and food security and nutrition initiatives in many developing countries.

Sustainable agriculture must be mindful of food quality and food's cultural significance while at the same time being environmentally sound and focused on farmers, especially smallholder farmers. Noted the objective of increasing agricultural production must be coupled with that of preserving agricultural biodiversity and environmental stewardship. Recognized that increasing food security for rural populations in developing countries must be done in a way that also improves nutritional status. Emphasized the importance of advocating for the inclusion of these topics in the process leading to the definition of the post-2015 development agenda.

Citing the adoption of the 1992 Rome Declaration and Plan of Action, argued that the success of the ICN2 depends largely on adoption of a substantial outcome document and suggested a model similar to the Rome Declaration could be used for the ICN2, that is, an outcome document which reaffirms shared principles and sets specific actions to guide, through realistic and measurable goals, the efforts of the international community. Noted the process of developing such an important document should be inclusive, involving civil society and the private sector, taking the latter's key roles in food security and nutrition and sustainable food systems, into account. Said the ICN2 outcome document could also be linked with the activities of the Committee on World Food Security (CFS) and its High Level Panel of

Experts on Food Security and Nutrition, “The CFS is the most inclusive international and intergovernmental platform involving all stakeholders and bears the advantage of being an already existing structure also reporting to ECOSOC.”

Recognized the importance of EXPO Milan 2015 - whose main theme is *Feeding the Planet, Energy for Life* - as a platform to disseminate key messages on food security and nutrition. The Expo is scheduled to occur only a few months after the ICN2 and just before, or during, the final adoption of the new global Agenda.

Expressed the hope that these ideas would be reflected in the final summary of the preparatory meeting. Noted the importance of reporting on the outcomes of the meeting’s three side events, one of which was organized by Italy on “Women and Nutrition: Ideas for a Sustainable Future”. Expects the outcome of these events will be taken into account as well, and commended the Swedish delegate and others for stressing the importance of gender issues in achieving nutrition related goals. Concluded that “Italy stands ready to play an active role during the preparatory process for the ICN2, especially with reference to the negotiations on the outcome document of the Conference.” Noted the time constraint for starting the intergovernmental process, but acknowledged that technical preparation had not yet been concluded. Framed the situation as a “transitional phase” where technical preparation has to be completed in collaboration with Members and in collaboration with relevant International Organizations. Noted that FAO and WHO would soon report to their respective Governing Bodies and stated the need to keep Members regularly informed on the preparatory process.

The Netherlands

Expressed appreciation for having all sectors represented at the meeting and stated that all sectors should be involved in ICN2 2014.

Tunisia

Food safety and hygiene issues represent a major burden worldwide, and as such should be taken into more consideration by the ICN2, than what was done in 1992. Both quality and quantity of food supply should be considered.

Nepal

Called for inclusion of water, sanitation and hygiene issues in the nutrition topics to be discussed in ICN2.

Sudan

Commended points raised by Zimbabwe. Noted the need to improve food consumption data, namely in regards to the need for additional cut-off points to distinguish between varying degrees of dietary quality (as opposed to a single cut-off point). Advocated for promotion of nutrition education to improve food and cooking habits and avoid loss of nutrients in food preparation. Need to foster collaboration on food fortification initiatives, particularly on vitamin A, zinc, iodine and omega 3.

Switzerland

Commended points raised by Russia regarding education and consumer dietary habits. Noted the importance of working over the long term, jointly with other measures, on consumer dietary habits. In regards to goals for the 2014 conference, endorsed the vision and objectives presented by co-Chair Dr

Troedsson, especially in regards to the post-2015 development agenda, “We believe that these objectives constitute the way to follow in the preparation of the next conference”.

Brazil

Confirmed Brazil would play an active role in the ICN2 preparatory process. In regards to implementation, it would be useful if the Secretariat could create a more inclusive mechanism in the planning of activities, including deadlines with timelines so that Members can be ready when decisions are made in regards to intergovernmental processes and so that countries can participate more fully in the follow up process.

TRANSITION TO THE WAY FORWARD: CO-CHAIR DR TROEDSSON

Before re-opening the floor to interventions from technical experts and others regarding Dr Pinstrup-Anderson’s summary, and to statements regarding the way forward, Dr Troedsson made the following response to Members statements on the way forward:

- Members wish to be more involved in the preparation for the ICN2. This needs to happen through a consultative and inter-governmental process. FAO and WHO secretariats fully acknowledge this and will revert back to you in this respect. There will be a report back to FAO and WHO’s Governing Bodies where Members will have the opportunity to instruct the Secretariat on how to move forward.
- There is need to do a full inventory of the technical knowledge available. This meeting has provided valuable inputs but there is more knowledge out there which needs to be recognized and included in the technical basis upon which the ICN2 will be predicated.
- There is also a need for involvement in the preparatory process and during the 2014 Conference of stakeholders based on their role and mandate.
- The FAO Secretariat has been requested by several Members to provide a road map of the process for ICN2 and beyond, especially in regards to how to link up with other global initiatives and events before the 2014 Conference. This will need to be finalized by FAO and WHO in consultation with stakeholders.

COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR, ROUND 3

Bioversity International

Provided the following written text:

1. The ICN2 should make more healthy and diverse diets as the entry point for discussions at ICN2 rather than individual nutrients or foods. Indeed, there have been too many interventions in the past focusing on particular categories of nutrients or particular micronutrients which fail to address malnutrition in a comprehensive way.
2. If we want to address better nutrition in the longer term, we must build in sustainability, as was mentioned by Dr Pinstrup-Andersen in his summary. The notion of *Sustainable Diets* is relevant to ICN2. This was the subject of the seminar organized by the SCN with FAO and Bioversity International on 12 November 2013 which provides a valuable input to the preparation of the ICN2, as was mentioned by the representative of Malawi in her intervention.

3. Pleased to hear many speakers highlighting the importance of diversity in agriculture and the need to change priorities in investments in agriculture and agricultural research, focusing on bringing more agricultural biodiversity into production systems. This point was also raised by Dr Pinstrup-Andersen and during the Brazilian intervention. It is necessary to rebalance the research portfolio with greater investments in research on agricultural biodiversity and the many species that are important for food security and nutrition, particularly of the most vulnerable. This is especially true for the public sector, as the private sector is investing heavily in a few major staples. Greater use of diversity in production systems can contribute both to more diverse and nutritious diets and to more sustainable production systems.

Germany

Endorsed the four action points presented by Dr Troedsson at the beginning of the session, emphasizing that action should be performed in parallel. The process of engaging Members and other UN agencies should be made in a transparent manner.

European Union

Endorsed the four action points presented by Dr Troedsson, adding that it is important to know when the road map will be defined and shared. Suggested the term “*member*” replace the term *member states*, and emphasized the need for transparency in the involvement of other Rome based agencies.

- Dr Troedsson acknowledged the point regarding terminology. He noted that not just Rome, but also Geneva and New York based UN agencies need to be involved and consulted.

International Agri-Food Network

The speaker introduced himself as Chair of the Private Sector Mechanism’s Nutrition Committee under the auspices of the International Agri-Food Network (IAFN) and consultant for the Mars Company on global food and nutrition security and food safety. Described the Network as a unique focal point for the food value chain from farmers to small and medium entrepreneurs, to large multinational companies, national associations and co-operatives. IAFN represents members in 135 countries.

Congratulated FAO, WHO and the experts for their preparations for this technical meeting and thanked the participants who offered their thoughtful and candid interventions and commentaries and for the consideration that allowed all participants from Civil Society and the Private Sector Mechanisms to be included in these final deliberations. Written text was provided.

“As we go forward together, we are committed to offer our tools and capabilities in robust partnerships with other stakeholders that seek to launch nutrition solutions for country driven programs and initiatives. We seek to help build on the game changing achievements of the past 5 years through a network of these partnerships that identify, prioritize and implement initiatives and programs in areas that can make a real difference.

The private sector recognizes the unique values it can leverage through public- private partnerships among key drivers to help:

1. support programs and initiatives to achieve the Zero Hunger Challenge;
2. fulfill the recommendations and guidance directions of the 2013 Lancet Series;
3. participate in the Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN) movement;

4. strengthen the policy dialogue and advocate for relevant UN Committee on World Food Security (UN CFS) guidelines;
5. shape the sustainable agricultural productivity and nutrition targets in the Post-2015 Development Framework; and
6. fulfill the mission of the Second International Conference on Nutrition (ICN2) to build a new nutrition policy framework.

We believe the following two principles are absolutely essential to help fulfill the mission of building a new nutrition policy framework:

1. embed nutrition in multi-sector strategies within national and local government plans and initiatives, stressing the valued roles for nutrition with health, agriculture, education, environment, finance, gender, diversity, and other development factors
2. recognize achieving Zero Hunger Challenge depends on collaborations among stakeholder partners to implement mutually shared, purpose driven goals and aspirations”.

Recommended that the ICN2 Secretariat would be well served to establish and maintain open, transparent interactive platforms and mechanisms for civil society and private sector mechanisms and other interested stakeholders to fully participate as the process and events move ahead over the next 12 months. Concluded by addressing “our friends and colleagues at FAO, WHO and the Civil Society Mechanism, to whom we express our interest and desire to work together to help create the environment for building trust as we seek to demonstrate the effective value of leveraging our capabilities in these partnerships. If we do this, we can achieve the win-win that Professor Anderson noted in his summary overview”.

Zimbabwe

Expressed appreciation regarding the information on the road map and suggested the process foresee a broader engagement of countries to assure buy-in. Supported Germany’s suggestion to build a common platform for discussion of the shared vision.

Portugal

Highlighted the necessity of laying down an interactive platform for the preparatory process. Recommended the process start with Secretariat reports, which could then be sent to members. Enquired how outcomes from this meeting would feed into the Rio process. Asked what the November Conference aims to achieve and what is expected as an outcome. Stated that information concerning the process of the work between now and 2014 needs to be provided, and that an interactive platform would be useful.

- Dr Troedsson acknowledged the need for:
 1. A report on the Preparatory Technical Meeting to be prepared.
 2. More information to be provided on the preparatory process for the 2014 Conference which will include a roadmap for the involvement of Members as well as other stakeholders.
 3. More thinking regarding the Conference’s outcome, conducted in close consultation with and led by Members. How this will be achieved can be outlined in the roadmap.
 4. More thinking regarding organization and logistics for the Conference. There is a Steering Committee Chaired by Mr Sundaram, which will work on this and share the information.

Algeria

Noted policy and research programmes are in place, but impact studies on people and improvement of nutrition are lacking. Supports the creation of an interactive platform for the ICN2 preparatory process, both in regards to an intergovernmental mechanism and so that the scientific community can post proposals and strengthen their engagement.

Action Against Hunger

Commended Dr Pinstруп-Andersen's summary, providing the following written text:

"We at action against hunger would like to see specific acknowledgement of the importance of nutrition dimension in under-fives and mothers. Pregnant and lactating women, babies and young children have heightened nutritional requirements, particularly between the point of conception, to complementary feeding phase and before aged two.

The magnitude of the number of children suffering from Global Acute Malnutrition (severe plus moderate) raises many emotive issues related to cause and effect, and the tools available to fix the problem seem rather inadequate in relation to need. Acute malnutrition or wasting is not only a emergency issue but is prevalent in many development contexts without conflict. It is a distinct issue and in many respect unlike stunting.

We would like the ICN2 to highlight that action and processes must therefore be planned and monitored in how far it is addressing these specific nutrition needs for children under five during 'the window of opportunities' to prevent impaired child growth, create healthy conditions for the women during pregnancy and that put the growing child at a lower risk of suffering from chronic diseases in adulthood.

ICN2 interventions can take specific care to create healthier environments, lower workloads and production focus to raise availability and utilisation of adequate diets for these children so they can reach the better lives the ICN2 aims to bring to the world".

- Dr Troedsson acknowledged the importance of not forgetting these issues within the current broad nutrition agenda

United Kingdom

The speaker stated that the all four agencies should work together on a common vision for the 2014 Conference. Fully integrating the concept of the SUN movement within this vision, possibly taking SUN to a global level, and ensuring participation of civil society and the private sector

United States

Suggested parallel sessions be held during the 2014 Conference, outcomes of which to be reported back to the Plenary. This would allow increased participation, interaction and discussion. Noted the importance of information technology in establishing global networks to continue the preparatory work for the 2014 Conference.

- Dr Troedsson acknowledged that how to organize the 2014 Meeting is an important consideration for the Steering Committee.

Save the Children

Was very pleased to be part of the ICN2 Preparatory Technical Meeting and was grateful to the organizers for allowing them to participate. Provided the following written text:

“Save the Children sees malnutrition as the Achilles heel of development. Addressing malnutrition requires political leadership and sustained investments in proven direct interventions. It requires a prioritization of, and investment in, nutrition sensitive approaches including social protection, agriculture, water and sanitation, education, the environment and climate change. Education for adolescent girls is particularly important as it affects how they care for their children. Adolescent girls were identified by the 2013 Lancet special issue as especially vulnerable to undernutrition and a group that provides a special opportunity to break the intergenerational cycle of malnutrition.

For nutrition-sensitive agriculture, the lack of evidence is a challenge. But this should not hold back action where we know, to some degree of certainty, what works and where action is needed today.

Tackling malnutrition requires an investment in data and the development of suitable, universal indicators, so that we are able to monitor and track our progress in this area. When commitments are made, strong accountability mechanisms should be put in place to ensure that they deliver real outcomes.

Investments in agriculture, through processes such as CAADP and the Global Agriculture and Food Security Programme should be reoriented from the current focus on production towards nutrition, and should include nutrition objectives and indicators.

The private sector has an important role to play in tackling malnutrition. Civil society needs to be better at supporting businesses that aim to deliver positive nutrition outcomes. We need to identify elements within public policy frameworks that both block and incentivise businesses to take nutrition sensitive approaches. At the same time, we need to ensure that businesses do not harm good nutritional practices. The regulation of the international code of the marketing of breast-milk substitutes is one area that needs attention.

Save the Children continues to work on these issues in 120 countries around the world, through our programme work and through our policy research and advocacy. Civil Society has a key role to play in holding Governments and policymakers to account for the commitments they make; it is therefore vital that they are involved in the ICN process. Save the Children would like to see an ambitious, action-led outcome document from ICN2 that can be used at the national and local level to tackle malnutrition. We look forward to working with you all on this over the next year”.

Civil Society Mechanism for the Committee on Food Security (CFS)

Considered the CFS Civil Society Mechanism a possible platform upon which a similar mechanism for the ICN2 preparatory process could be modeled. Noted the CFS civil society mechanism is highly inclusive, involving stakeholder participation in food and nutrition, gender, agriculture, climate change, hunger, NCDs and consumers.

1000 Days Partnerships

Commended the call for data disaggregation listed on page one and two of the Meeting's Summary of the first two days. However also urged that, in addition to income quintile, age and gender be included as an expansion of previous remarks to ensure coverage of the vital 1000 days window. Expressed appreciation for the funding and accountability messages heard earlier and encouraged these be considered for the 2014 Conference. Remarked that doing so would be a huge service; however she also expressed agreement on the need to build justification for funding, as well as ways to work together to ensure acceleration of the WHA nutrition target.

In regards to the post-2015 development agenda, suggested taking the opportunity early in 2014 to build bold but achievable goals, targets and indicators. Noted that this is happening in WASH, education, health, and agriculture, and encouraged nutrition to follow suit. Noted there is agreement on what components work – building on the WHA nutrition targets and others – and that what is needed is to take this work to scale.

Requested instead of talking about what is an opportunity for agriculture or for health, we ensure that people, children and communities are kept at the heart of our efforts. Noted that the ICN2 was an opportunity to take early work across SUN to scale, and that this work, together with the Civil Society Mechanism for the CFS, and the 1,000 Days Partnership, offers an opportunity for a participatory mechanism to ensure the preparatory process is interactive.

Peoples Health Movement

Called upon the ICN2 process to start at the grass roots. Change will come when countries progressively realise the right to food. Civil society should act as a watch dog to monitor the commitment of governments to it and progress in achieving it. Considered that reaching a common vision is ideological and argued the policies we have now are conservative. Noted the challenge of bridging the ideological gap to put the people first, and stated that in the next 12 months, discussions on technical as well as political issues will have to be held.

- Dr Troedsson reiterated the importance of linking the political dimension and the technical dimension in preparing for the 2014 Conference.

CLOSING REMARKS: CO- CHAIR DR SUNDARAM

The meeting has been a success and this has been largely due to you. So I want to thank you all. But we have been reminded by many of this morning's interventions, there is much that remains to do and much which needs to be done better in future. Specifically there is a great deal left to do in the 369 days which are left before the ICN2. The difficulty of working on nutrition in a governmental as well as an intergovernmental context is that nutrition is often an orphan. No ministry feels ownership for it. This is the challenge that we have before us. I hope that we have been successful in raising the level of understanding of the nutrition challenges we face. But clearly – as we have been reminded over the last three days – there is much more that we need to do to raise the level of consciousness especially outside of this room. This is why there is much to be done in the 369 days ahead. This is not a time for long speeches so I shall conclude by thanking all of you here as well as the Secretariat and WHO as well as our other cooperating partners for their active involvement and support. Finally I would like to

conclude on a note that my Co-Chair Hans Troedsson introduced at the beginning: no nutrients no life. Or if you want to be more Lennonist, “All we are saying, is give nutrition a chance”.

CLOSING REMARKS: CO- CHAIR DR TROEDSSON

Jomo has spoken on behalf of FAO and WHO. A successful meeting is when people are not completely happy. I have heard constructive criticism, frustration and impatience. Members now can provide feedback on what is needed to be done in the months ahead. This is not an FAO-WHO business alone but everybody's endeavour.

FAO and WHO are committed to this event – which can be very important if we do it right. It needs not only effort and work but it also needs buy-in, not ‘leave it to others’ in the hope it will work out well. So I am really pleading for your full participation and commitment from all of you to take this process on. As such we will suggest road maps and will be open to adjusting them. Thank you very, very much, and have a safe journey back, wherever you have come from.

FOLLOW UP AND WAY FORWARD

Country representatives made the following recommendations for planning the way forward for the 2014 high-level event:

1. It is expected that the ICN2 will reach consensus on a global policy framework that addresses current and foreseeable major nutrition challenges. Such a political outcome document (Consensus, Declaration or Accord) will require consensus, mediated through an intergovernmental process, accompanied by a technical document prepared by the Secretariat that provides a framework or plan of action to guide its implementation.
2. As nutrition is, by nature, multi-sectoral, the outcome document should specify ways by which nutrition may be improved through the food system, including agriculture and trade, as well as in health and social protection. ICN2 should build the political will and secure the financial commitment for implementation at country level. The process for preparing these documents should be inclusive and participatory and rolled out according to a roadmap to be prepared by the FAO/WHO Secretariat.
3. FAO and WHO were requested to communicate the outcome of the Preparatory Technical Meeting and the next steps expected to their respective governing bodies at the earliest opportunity. The FAO/WHO Secretariat should also prepare briefings for Permanent Representatives in Rome, Geneva and New York.
4. At the technical level, a consolidated summary of the major nutrition challenges and viable options should be prepared, drawing upon the preparatory work already undertaken.
5. Regional perspectives should be incorporated in the political declaration and technical framework of action for ICN2, taking into consideration the regional consultations conducted as part of the ICN2 preparatory process and the forthcoming 2014 FAO Regional Conferences and WHO Regional Committee meetings.
6. ICN2 should be informed by other international food and nutrition security initiatives including the post-2015 development agenda, the Zero Hunger Challenge, and the SUN movement, and feed into Milan Expo 2015.

7. FAO and WHO should strengthen their cooperation, engagement, commitment and resource mobilization efforts in ICN2 preparations. An effective fund raising exercise is urgently required as part of an effective resource mobilization strategy to support preparations for and organization of ICN2. An effective communications strategy to give greater visibility to ICN2 and its key messages should be developed.
8. FAO and WHO should convene a meeting of the ICN2 Steering Committee to plan and implement next steps towards the ICN2 High-Level Conference, including deciding on its format.

WAY FORWARD

The following was called for:

- FAO and WHO should facilitate establishment of an intergovernmental process led by Member States to develop a brief outcome document for ICN2.
- The intergovernmental process should involve all regional groupings.
- The joint FAO/WHO Secretariat should prepare a zero draft of the document for consideration by the intergovernmental processes.
- Involvement of non-state actors in ICN2 should be considered.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

- **FAO MEMBERS AND ASSOCIATE**
- **REPRESENTATIVES OF UNITED NATIONS AND SPECIALIZED AGENCIES**
- **INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTES AND ORGANIZATIONS**
- **OBSERVERS FROM CIVIL SOCIETY AND PRIVATE SECTOR**
- **PANELIST, PRESENTERS AND RESOURCE PEOPLE**

ALGERIA - ALGÉRIE - ARGELIA

Délégué

Mme Mounira AZOUZ
 Attachée de la Recherche
 Institute National de la Recherche
 Agronomique d'Algérie

ARGENTINA - ARGENTINE

Delegado

Excmo. Sr Don Gustavo O. INFANTE
 Representante Permanente Adjunto de la República
 Argentina ante la FAO Encargado de Negocios a.i.

Suplente(s)

Sra Andrea Silvina REPETTI A. S.
 Representante Permanente Alterno de la República
 Argentina ante la FAO

AUSTRALIA - AUSTRALIE

Delegate

Ms Janine LEWIS
 Principal Nutritionist
 Public Health Nutrition Standards Section Food
 Standards Australia

AUSTRIA - AUTRICHE

Delegate

Ursula SCHWARTZ
 Deputy Head of Division III 3, Federal
 Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry,
 Environment and Water Management

BELGIUM - BELGIQUE - BÉLGICA

Délégué

Mr Marc HEIRMAN
 Ministre-Conseiller
 Représentante permanente adjoint de la
 Belgique auprès de l'OAA

Suppléant(s)

Mme Lieselot GERMONPREZ
 Attaché
 Représentation permanente de la Belgique
 auprès de l'OAA

BRAZIL - BRÉSIL - BRASIL

Delegate

H.E. Antonino MARQUES PORTO
 Permanent Representative of Brazil to FAO

Alternate(s)

Ms Candice SAKAMOTO SOUZA VIANNA
 Alternate, Permanent Representative of
 Brazil to FAO

Mr Rafael TORINO

Director of Educational Actions
 National Fund for the Development of
 Education (FNDE)

BURKINA FASO

Délégué

M Laurent COULIDIATI
 Conseiller en Agriculture
 Représentant permanent adjoint
 auprès de l'OAA

BURUNDI

Délégué

M Jean Bosco NDINDURUVUGO
 Premier Conseiller
 Chargé de la Représentation
 permanente auprès de l'OAA

**CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC –
 RÉPUBLIQUE CENTRAFRICAINE –
 REPÚBLICA CENTROAFRICANA**

Délégué

Mme Marie-Honorine BRAHIM
 Coordonnatrice National du
 Comité Inter-Etats des Pesticides
 d'Afrique Centrale (CPAC/RCA)

CHINA - CHINE

Delegate

Ms Liping SHEN
 First Secretary
 Alternate, Permanent Representative of the
 People's Republic of China to FAO

COSTA RICA

Delegado

Excmo. Sr. Don Fernando SÁNCHEZ CAMPOS
Representante Permanente de Costa Rica ante
la FAO

Suplente(s)

Sra Doña Estela BLANCO SOLÍS
Ministra Consejera
Representante Permanente Alternativa de Costa
Rica ante la FAO

Sr Don Orlando Guzmán VÁSQUEZ
Representante Permanente Alternativo de Costa
Rica ante la FAO

CUBA

Delegado

Sra Doña Silvia María ALVAREZ ROSSELL
Primer Secretario
Representante Permanente Adjunto de Cuba
ante la FAO

Suplente(s)

Sr Don Luís Alberto MARÍN LLANES
Tercer Secretario
Representante Permanente Alternativo de Cuba
ante la FAO

CZECH REPUBLIC - RÉPUBLIQUE TCHÈQUE REPÚBLICA CHECA

Delegate

H.E. Jiri MUCHKA
Permanent Representative of the
Czech Republic to FAO

DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF KOREA RÉPUBLIQUE POPULAIRE DÉMOCRATIQUE DE CORÉE - REPÚBLICA POPULAR DEMOCRÁTICA DE COREA

Delegate

H.E. Chun Guk KIM CHUN GUK
Permanent Representative
of the Democratic People's Republic of
Korea to FAO

Alternate(s)

Mr Chol Min KIM C. M.
Alternate, Permanent Representative of the
Democratic People's Republic of Korea
to the FAO

DENMARK - DANEMARK – DINAMARCA

Delegate

Mr Morten ANDERSEN
Head of Section, Nutrition Office
Danish Veterinary and Food Administration

EL SALVADOR

Delegado

Ms Clara Norma ARGUETA DE MANZANARES
Asesor Despacho Ministerial
Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería

EUROPEAN UNION (MEMBER ORGANIZATION) UNION EUROPÉENNE (ORGANISATION MEMBRE) - UNIÓN EUROPEA (ORGANIZACIÓN MIEMBRO)

Delegate

Mr Roberto RIDOLFI
Director for Sustainable Growth and
Development, DEVCO/C
European Commission

Alternate(s)

Mr Jean Pierre HALKIN
DG DEVCO Head of Unit C1
European Commission

Mr Alessandro Villa
Alternate, Permanent Representative
of the European Commission to FAO

FINLAND - FINLANDE - FINLANDIA

Delegate

Ms Minna HUTTUNEN
Senior Officer, Food Policy
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry

FRANCE - FRANCIA

Délégué

S.E. Mme Bérengère QUINCY B.
Représentante permanente de la France
auprès de l'OAA

Suppléant(s)

Mme Donatienne HISSARD
Représentante permanente adjointe de la
France auprès de l'OAA

Mme Marion BRETONNIÈRE-LE-DÛ
Secrétariat Interministériel
du Conseil National de l'Alimentation

Mme Marie-Caroline DODÉ
Sous-direction de la santé,
de la sécurité alimentaire et du
développement humain
Ministère des Affaires étrangères

GEORGIA - GÉORGIE

Delegate

Mr Robizon TSIKLARI
Chief Specialist
Non-communicable Diseases Department,
National Center for Disease Control and
Public Health

GERMANY - ALLEMAGNE - ALEMANIA

Delegate

H.E. Thomas WRIESSNIG
Permanent Representative of the
Federal Republic of Germany to FAO and other
International Organizations

Alternate(s)

Ms Angelina BALZ
Nutritionist, Division 622
Federal Ministry for Food, Agriculture and
Consumer Protection

Mr Thomas HAUSSMANN

Alternate, Permanent Representative of the
Federal Republic of Germany to FAO and other
International Organizations

Mr Andreas GRANSEE

Head of Applied Research and Advisory Service Agro
K+S KALI GmbH

Mr Johannes WILLMANN

Permanent Representation of the Federal Republic
of Germany to FAO and other International
Organizations

GHANA

Delegate

H.E. Evelyn A. STOKES-HAYFORD
Permanent Representative of Ghana to the FAO

Alternate(s)

Mr Nii QUAYE-KUMAH
Alternate, Permanent Representative of Ghana to
the FAO

HAITI - HAÏTI - HAITÍ

Délégué

Mme Joseline MARHONÉ PIERRE
Directrice, Programme de nutrition
Ministère de la Santé Publique et de la Population

Suppléant(s)

Mme Marie Laurence DURAND M.L.
Premier Secrétaire, Représentant suppléant de la
République d'Haïti auprès de la FAO

HUNGARY - HONGRIE - HUNGRIA

Delegate

Ms Ágnes SZEGEDYNÉ FRICZ
Head of Division
Ministry of Rural Development

ICELAND – ISLANDE - ISLANDIA

Delegate

Mr Gudni BRAGASON
Minister Plenipotentiary to FAO
Permanent Representative of Iceland to FAO

**IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF)
IRAN (RÉPUBLIQUE ISLAMIQUE D')
IRÁN (REPÚBLICA ISLÁMICA DEL)**

Delegate

H.E. Seyed A. TAGHAVI MOTLAGH SEYED
Permanent Representative of The Islamic
Republic of Iran to FAO

Alternate(s)

Mr Seyed Morteza ZAREI SEYED
Alternate, Permanent Representative of
the Islamic Republic of Iran to FAO

Mr Alireza MOHAJER A.
Alternate, Permanent Representative of
the Islamic Republic of Iran to FAO

IRAQ

Delegate

H.E. Hassan JANABI
Permanent Representative of the Republic
of Iraq to FAO

Alternate(s)

Mr Alaa SHATAWI
Director of Nutrition Research Institute
Ministry of Health

Ms Ala MASHTA
Technical Employee of the Permanent
Representation of Iraq to FAO

IRELAND – IRLANDE - IRLANDA

Delegate

Mr Damien KELLY
Deputy Permanent Representative of Ireland
to FAO

Alternate(s)

Ms Ursula O' DWYER
Health Promotion Policy Adviser
Department of Health

ITALY - ITALIE - ITALIA

Delegate

Mr Luca FRATINI
Deputy Permanent Representative of Italy to FAO

Alternate(s)

Mr Roberto COPPARONI
Department of Food, Nutrition and Veterinary
Public Health
Ministry of Health

Mr Simone IEVOLELLA
General Directorate for Development Cooperation
Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Mr Marco SILANO
Istituto Superiore della Sanità
Ministry of Health

Mr Mauro GHIROTTI
General Directorate for Development Cooperation
Ministry of Foreign Affairs

JORDAN - JORDANIE - JORDANIA

Delegate

Mr Fiesal R.S. AL ARGAN
Deputy Permanent Representative of the
Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan to FAO

LEBANON - LIBAN - LÍBANO

Délégué

M Karim KHALIL K.
Représentant permanent suppléant de la
République libanaise auprès de la FAO

Suppléant(s)

Mme Rania EL HAYEK
Ingénieur de l'agriculture
Ministère de l'agriculture

LESOTHO

Delegate

Ms Masekonyela SEBOTSA
Director, Food and Nutrition Co-ordinating
Office

Alternate(s)

Mrs Malikopo Patricia RAKOOTJE
Alternate Permanent Representative of the
Kingdom of Lesotho to FAO, WFP and IFAD

LIBERIA - LIBÉRIA

Delegate

Mr Mohammed S. SHERIFF
Minister Plenipotentiary
Permanent Representative to FAO

Alternate(s)

Mr A. Haruna-Rashid KROMAH
Secretary
Embassy of the Republic of Liberia

MADAGASCAR

Délégué

Mr Julien Ernest ANDRIAMAHAZO
Chef de Service de la Sécurité Alimentaire
Ministère de l'agriculture

Suppléant

Mme Holy Mala RAOBELINA
Responsable Recherche et Développement
Office National de Nutrition

MALAWI

Delegate

Mrs Jean CHILEMBA
Director for Nutrition
Department of Nutrition, HIV and AIDS
Ministry of Health

Alternate

Mrs Edith MKAWA
Principal Secretary
Office of the President and Cabinet

Ms Sungani V. KAUNDA
Personal Secretary
Department of Nutrition, HIV and AIDS

Mrs Maggie LWANDA
Deputy Director for Nutrition, HIV and AIDS
Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation and Water
Development

Mr Mcleod MUYEPA
Deputy Director Planning, Research and
Environment Department of Nutrition, HIV and AIDS

Mr Felix PENSULO PHIRI
Deputy Director for Nutrition
Department of Nutrition, HIV and AIDS
Ministry of Health

Mr Mpeta MWANYONGO
Assistant Director for Environmental Affairs
Ministry of Environment and Climate Change
Management

MALAYSIA - MALAISIE - MALASIA

Delegate

Mr Amir HARUN
Alternate, Permanent Representative of Malaysia
to FAO
Assistant Agricultural Attaché

Alternate(s)

Mr Dzulkifli ABDUL-WAHAB
Alternate Permanent Representative of Malaysia
to FAO

MEXICO - MEXIQUE - MÉXICO

Delegado

Excmo. Sr Miguel RUIZ-CABAÑAS IZQUIERDO
Representante Permanente de México
ante la FAO

Suplente

Sr Don Benito Santiago JIMENEZ SAUMA
Representante Permanente Alterno
de México ante la FAO

NEPAL

Delegate

Mr Radha K. PRADHAN
Programme Director, Health and Nutrition
Social Development Division
National Planning Commission

NETHERLANDS - PAYS-BAS - PAÍSES BAJOS

Delegate

Mr Mario J. LEEFLANG
Senior Policy Advisor Food & Nutrition
Security
Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Alternate

Mr Paulus M. VERSCHUREN
Special Envoy Food and Nutrition Security for
Development
Ministry of Foreign Affairs

NIGER

Délégué

Mme Hassane HAMIDOU AISSATOU Cissé
Chef de division
Nutrition et Alimentation
Direction Générale de l'Agriculture
Ministère de l'agriculture

NORWAY - NORVÈGE - NORUEGA

Delegate

H.E. Åse E. BJERKE
Section for Climate, Global Health and
Sustainable Development

Alternate

Ms Arnhild H. RIMESTAD
Senior Adviser
Norwegian Directorate of Health

PAKISTAN - PAKISTÁN

Delegate

Mr Zulfiqar Haider KHAN Z. H.
Agriculture Counsellor
Alternate, Permanent Representative of the
Republic of Pakistan

PHILIPPINES - FILIPINAS

Delegate

Mr Esteban PAGARAN
Assistant Agricultural Attaché
Alternate, Permanent Representative of Philippines
to FAO

Alternate

Ms Maria Bernardita FLORES
Assistant Secretary of Health
Executive Director
National Nutrition Council

PORTUGAL

Delegate

Ms Edite AZENHA
Adviser
Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries

**RUSSIAN FEDERATION - FÉDÉRATION DE RUSSIE -
FEDERACIÓN DE RUSIA**

Delegate

Mr. Victor A. TUTELYAN
Director
FSBI "Institute of Nutrition RAMS"
Russian Academy of Medical Sciences
Moscow

Alternate(s)

Mr Oleg KOBIKOV
First Counsellor
Alternate Permanent Representative of the
Russian Federation to FAO and other UN Agencies
in Rome

Mr Anatoliy KUTYSHENKO
Member of the Commission on Healthcare
Russian Union of Industrialists and Entrepreneurs
(RSPP), Moscow

Mr Ivan KONSTANTINOPOLSKIY
Third Secretary
Alternate Permanent Representative
Permanent Mission of the Russian Federation
to FAO and other UN Agencies in Rome

SIERRA LEONE

Delegate

Ms Aminata Shamit KOROMA
Director of Food and Nutrition
Ministry of Health and Sanitation

Alternate

Mr Mohamed Ajuba SHERIFF
Deputy Director
Planning Evaluation Monitoring and Statistics
Division
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and
Food Security

SLOVAKIA - SLOVAQUIE - ESLOVAQUIA

Delegate

Ms Marieta OKENKOVÁ
Permanent Representative of the Slovak
Republic to FAO and WFP

SOUTH AFRICA - AFRIQUE DU SUD SUDÁFRICA

Delegate

Mr Moshibudi RAMPEDI
Alternate Permanent Representative of
South Africa to FAO

Alternate(s)

Ms Zasembo Angel SISPHEHLE MKHIZE
Department of Agriculture Forestry and
Fisheries

Ms Lehlakoane Maria MOKOENA
Department of Agriculture Forestry and
Fisheries

SPAIN - ESPAGNE – ESPAÑA

Delegado

Sra Alicia CRESPO PAZOS
Subdirección General de Estructura de la
Cadena Alimentaria
Ministerio de Agricultura, Alimentación y
Medio Ambiente

SRI LANKA

Delegate

Ms Gothami INDIKADAHENA
Minister (Commercial)
Deputy Permanent Representative of Sri Lanka
to FAO, IFAD & WFP

Alternate(s)

Mr Chameera C. YAPA ABEYWARDANE
Nutrition Coordinator
Ministry of Agriculture

SUDAN - SOUDAN - SUDÁN

Delegate

Mr Khalid M. OSMAN
Alternate Permanent Representative
of Sudan to FAO

Alternate(s)

Ms Agba ABBAS AHMED GADAH-ELDAM
Assistant Professor of Human Nutrition & Dietetics,
Head Department of Family Sciences at University
of Khartoum

SWITZERLAND - SUISSE - SUIZA

Délégué

Mme Christina BLANK
Conseillère
Représentante Adjointe
Représentation permanente de la Suisse auprès
de la FAO, du FIDA et du PAM

Suppléant(s)

Mme Ladina KNAPP
Assistante chargée de projet
Représentation permanente de la Suisse
auprès de la FAO, du FIDA et du PAM

THAILAND - THAILANDE – TAILANDIA

Delegate

Mr Visith CHAVASIT
Director of the Institute of Nutrition, Food Science
and Technology Specialist Institute of Nutrition
Mahidol University

**THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF
MACEDONIA –
L'EX-RÉPUBLIQUE YOUGOSLAVE DE MACÉDOINE –
LA EX REPÚBLICA YUGOSLAVA DE MACEDONIA**

Delegate
Ms Elisaveta PANOVSKA
Alternate Permanent Representative
Chargé d'affaires a.i.

TIMOR-LESTE

Delegate
Mr Jose DOS REIS MAGNO
Director General of the Ministry of Health

Alternate
Mr Gil RANGEL DA CRUZ
Director of Agriculture and Horticulture
Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries

TOGO

Délégué
Mme Abra Mawunya AFETSE EPSE TAY
Directrice de l'administration générale au
Ministère des Affaires Étrangères et de la
coopération

**TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO - TRINITÉ-ET-TOBAGO -
TRINIDAD Y TABAGO**

Delegate
Ms Anesa ALI-RODRIGUEZ
Counsellor
Permanent Mission of Trinidad and Tobago to
the United Nations Offices in Geneva

Alternate(s)
Ms Taryn PHILLIP
Manager, Nutrition and Dietetics
Ministry of Health

TUNISIA - TUNISIE – TÚNEZ

Délégué
Mme Wassila GZARA
Vétérinaire Principale à la Direction de la
Conservation du Milieu et de La Protection de
l'Environnement

UNITED KINGDOM - ROYAME-UNI - REINO UNIDO

Delegate
Mr Alan DANGOUR
Senior Adviser
Department of Population Health
London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine

**UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA – RÉPUBLIQUE
UNIE DE TANZANIE - REPÚBLICA UNIDA DE
TANZANÍA**

Delegate
Mr Ayoub MNDEME
Alternate Permanent Representative of the United
Republic of Tanzania to FAO

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA - ÉTATS-UNIS
D'AMÉRIQUE - ESTADOS UNIDOS DE AMÉRICA**

Delegate
Ms Elizabeth BUCKINGHAM
Nutrition and Gender Advisor
U.S. Department of State

Alternate(s)
Ms Sally ABBOTT
Nutrition Advisor, Bureau for Food Security
United States Agency for International
Development

Mr Omar DARY
Public Health Nutrition and Food Fortification

URUGUAY

Delegado
Sr. Oscar Gabriel PINEYRO
Representante Permanente Alterno de Uruguay
ante la FAO

**VENEZUELA (BOLIVARIAN REPUBLIC OF) - VENEZUELA
(RÉPUBLIQUE BOLIVARIENNE DU) - VENEZUELA
(REPÚBLICA BOLIVARIANA DE)**

Delegado
Excma. Sra. Doña Gladys URBANEJA DURAN
Representante Permanente de la República
Bolivariana de Venezuela ante la FAO

Suplente(s)

Sr Luis ALVAREZ FERMIN
Representante Permanente Alterno de la
República Bolivariana de Venezuela ante
la FAO

Sr Manuel CLAROS OVIEDO
Representante Permanente Alterno de la
República Bolivariana de Venezuela ante
la FAO

ZIMBABWE

Delegate
Ms Irene BOSHA I.
Counsellor
Alternate Permanent Representative
to FAO

ASSOCIATE MEMBERS OF FAO

HOLY SEE - SAINT-SIÈGE - SANTA SEDE

Délégué

S.E. Monseigneur Luigi TRAVAGLINO
Observateur Permanent du Saint-
Siège auprès de la FAO

Suppléant(s)

M Buonomo VINCENZO
Bureau de l'Observateur Permanent
du Saint-Siège auprès de la FAO

M José Cleberson DE FREITAS SILVA
Bureau de l'Observateur Permanent
du Saint-Siège auprès de la FAO

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED NATIONS AND SPECIALIZED AGENCIES

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF UN

Mr Jomo Kwame SUNDARAM
Assistant Director-General
Economic and Social Development Department

Mr David HALLAM
Director
Trade and Markets Division
Economic and Social Development Department

Ms Anna LARTEY
Director
Nutrition Division
Economic and Social Development Department

Mr Mark HOLDERNESS
Executive Secretary
Global Forum on Agricultural Research

Mr Harry PALMIER
Partnership Adviser
Global Forum for Agricultural Research

Mr Mark SMULDERS
Senior Economist
Agricultural Development Economics Division

Prof Eliot BERRY
School of Public Health
The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Mr Brian THOMPSON
Senior Nutrition Officer
Nutrition Division
Economic and Social Development Department

Leslie AMOROSO
Consultant
Nutrition Division
Economic and Social Development Department

FAO REGIONAL OFFICES

Ms Anne CHELE
Joint Programme Coordinator
FAO Representation in Kenya

Ms Fatima HACHEM
Senior Nutrition Officer
Regional Office for the Near East and North Africa

Ms Eleonora DUPOUY
Food Safety and Consumer Protection Officer
Regional Office for Europe and Central Asia

Ms Stacia NORDIN
Nutrition Officer
FAO Representation in Malawi

Ms Beatrice OKELLO
Agricultural Economist
FAO Representation in Uganda

Ms Margaret WAGAH
FAO Representation in Kenya

HIGH LEVEL TASK FORCE ON THE GLOBAL FOOD SECURITY CRISIS

Mr David NABARRO
Special Representative on Food Security and
Nutrition for the United Nations

INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr James GARRETT
Senior Research Staff

Mr Sean KENNEDY
Technical Adviser
Human Health and Nutrition

NORDIC COUNCIL OF MINISTERS

Ms Lene Breum LARSEN
Senior Adviser

**OFFICE OF THE SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE OF
THE UNSG FOR FOOD SECURITY AND NUTRITION**

Ms Marlen SCHUEPBACH
Policy Advisor / Liaison Officer

INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANISATION

Ms Christina BEHRENDT
Social Policy Specialist
Social Protection Department

UN SPECIAL RAPPORTEUR ON THE RIGHT TO FOOD

Mr Jose Luis VIVERO POL
Research Assistant

UNITED NATIONS CHILDREN'S FUND

Ms Julia KRASEVEC
Expert in Nutrition and Data Analysis

Mr Werner SCHULTINK
Chief, Nutrition
Associate Director, Programme Division

UNITED NATIONS STANDING COMMITTEE ON NUTRITION

Ms Lina MAHY
Technical Officer

Ms Marzella WÜSTEFELD
Technical Officer

Ms Cécile JONCKHEERE

Mrs Wendy LEUNG

WORLD FOOD PROGRAMME

Mr Ramiro, LOPES DA SILVA
UNSCN Chair and Deputy Executive Director

Mr Martin Bloem
Senior Nutrition Adviser
WFP's UNAIDS Global Coordinator

Mr Andrea Galante
Consultant
WFP Centre of Excellence Against Hunger

Ms Christiani BUANI
Programme Officer
WFP Centre of Excellence Against Hunger

WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

Dr Hans Anders TROEDSSON
Executive Director of the Director-General's Office

Dr Francesco BRANCA
Director of the Department of Nutrition for
Health and Development

Dr Chizuru NISHIDA
Coordinator
Nutrition Policy and Scientific Advice (NPU)
Department of Nutrition for Health and Development (NHD)

WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION

Ms Christiane WOLFF
Counsellor, Agriculture and
Commodities Division

WORLD BANK

Ms Lynn BROWN
Independent Adviser

Ms Leslie ELDER
Senior Nutrition Specialist
Health, Nutrition & Population
Human Development Network

Mr Yurie HOBERG
Senior Economist on the Rural Strategy and
Policy Group in the Agriculture and Rural Development Department

INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTES AND ORGANIZATIONS

INTERNATIONAL COLLECTIVE IN SUPPORT OF FISHWORKERS

Mr Brian O'RIORDAN
The Secretary, ICSF Belgium Office

INTERNATIONAL FOOD POLICY RESEARCH INSTITUTE

Mr Harold ALDERMAN
Senior Research Staff

Ms Marie RUEL
Director, Poverty, Health, and Nutrition Division

Mr Stuart GILLESPIE
Senior Research Staff
Poverty, Health, and Nutrition

INTERNATIONAL LIVESTOCK RESEARCH INSTITUTE

Ms Grace DELIA
Programme Manager

ORGANISATION FOR ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr Franco SASSI
Senior Health Economist, Organisation for Economic
Co-operation and Development

OBSERVERS FROM CIVIL SOCIETY AND PRIVATE SECTOR

1000 DAYS

Ms Jennifer RIGG
Director of Policy and Partnerships

ACTION AGAINST HUNGER

Mr Etienne DU VACHAT
Food Security Advocacy Officer

Mr Samuel HAUENSTEIN SWAN
Senior Policy Advisor

BARILLA

Mr Luca RUINI
Health, Safety, Environment & Energy Director

CIVIL SOCIETY MECHANISM

Mr William CHILUFYA
National Coordinator Zambia
Scaling Up Nutrition Alliance

Ms Nicoletta DENTICO
Advisor on public health
Health Innovation in Practice

Mr Davinder LAMBA
Habitat International Coalition

Mr Claudio SCHUFTAN
People's Health Movement

Mr Flavio VALENTE
Secretary General
FIAN International Secretariat

CONCERN WORLDWIDE

Mr Gudrun STALLKAMP
Nutrition Advisor

GLOBAL HARVEST INITIATIVE

Ms Ann STEENSLAND
Senior Associate

GLOBAL DONOR PLATFORM

Mr Christian SCHULZE
Advisor, Global Donor Platform for Rural Development

INTERNATIONAL LIFE SCIENCES INSTITUTE

Ms Susanne S. HARRIS
Executive Director

MEAT AND LIVESTOCK

Ms Veronique DROULEX
Senior Nutrition Manager
Australia

SAVE THE CHILDREN

Mr Francesco AURELI
Representative to the International Institutions

Ms Marie RUMSBY
Policy and Advocacy Adviser – Hunger

WORLD VISION

Ms Miriam YIANNAKIS
Nutrition Policy and Partnerships Advisor
Nutrition Center of Expertise
Global Health and WASH Team

PANELIST, PRESENTERS AND RESOURCE PEOPLE

Mr Bruce TRAILL
Professor of Food Economics
University of Reading

Mr Donald (Diego) ROSE
Professor, Head of Nutrition Section
Department of Global Community Health and Behavioral Sciences
Tulane University School of Public Health and Tropical Medicine

Mr David E. SAHN
International Professor of Economics
Cornell University

Mr Miguel I. GOMEZ
Ruth and William Morgan Assistant Professor
Dyson School of Applied Economics and Management
Cornell University

Mr Per PINSTRUP-ANDERSEN
Professor Emeritus
Division of Nutritional Sciences
Cornell University

Ms Rachel NUGENT
Director of the Disease Control Priorities
Network
Department of Global Health
University of Washington

Mr Stephen DEVEREUX
Research Fellow
UK Institute of Development Studies

Ms Katie RICKETTS
Research Associate
Tata-Cornell Agriculture Nutrition Initiative

Charles H. Dyson School of Applied Economics and Management
Cornell University

Ms Corinna HAWKES
Head of Policy and Public Affairs
World Cancer Research Fund International

Mr Jeff WAAGE
Director
London International Development Centre

Mr Michael SAMSON
Director of Research
Economic Policy Research Institute
Visiting Associate Professor of Economics
Williams College

Mr Patrick WEBB
Dean for Academic Affairs
Friedman School of Nutrition Science and Policy
Tutfs University

Mr Gert W. MEIJER
Deputy Head of Corporate Regulatory and Scientific Affairs
Nestlé

Ms Prema RAMACHANDRAN
Director
Nutrition Foundation of India

Ms Jessica FANZO
Assistant Professor of Nutrition
Institute of Human Nutrition and Department of Pediatrics
Senior Advisor of Nutrition Policy
Center for Globalization and Sustainable Development
Columbia University

Mr John HUMPHREY
Professor
Institute of Development Studies
University of Liverpool

Ms Margaret GILL
Professor of Integrated Land Use
University of Aberdeen

Mr Prakash SHETTY, MD PhD
Professor of Public Health Nutrition

University of Southampton

Ms Heather DANTON
Food Security and Nutrition Director
SPRING

Ms Cristina TIRADO
Adjunct Associate Professor
Department of Community Health Sciences
School of Public Health
University of California Los Angeles

Mr George KENT
Professor
University of Hawaii

Mr Jimi ADESINA
Professor at the South African Research
Chair in Social Policy
University of South Africa

Ms Tessa VORBOHLE
Livelihoods Coordinator
HelpAge International

Mr Vittal KATIKIREDDI
Doctor and Lecturer
Public Health and Health Policy
University of Glasgow

Ms Eileen Theresa KENNEDY
Professor, Friedman School of Nutrition Science and Policy
Tufts University

Ms Bonnie McCLAFFERTY
Director, Agriculture and Nutrition
Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition

Mr Robert PEDERSON
Research Fellow
Foodscapes, Innovation and Networks
Department of Development and Planning

Ms Nadia SILIMANI
Group Head
International Agency for Research on Cancer/World health Organization