

Let me start by joining colleagues and express our appreciation to you Mr Rapporteur and to the Secretary and his Team for the hard work and for the good quality of the document.

I agree that this is an excellent learning process for all of us, much more than for yourself, Mr Rapporteur, having a strong technical background and experience in this specific field.

It is needless to say, I fully align myself with the statement made by the EU Focal Point and pleased to confirm that we are going to prepare and submit detailed comments and also responses to the 3 specific questions. We strongly support the EU statement on the importance of research and we agree that policy recommendations should be science and evidence based. In this regard, I wish to underline that science should be neutral and independent.

I wish to refer to the recently launched SOFI Report. We are particularly happy that for the first time in history, the CFS Chair was present at the launch event and delivered his intervention. It has an important symbolic value and it is also a recognition to all of us, as CFS stakeholders.

This year the SOFI Report is having a new element. It makes a clear reference and quantify some of the externalities, the so-called “hidden” costs, such as of public health and of the GHG emissions. This confirms the need for having a clear reference to **all** positive and negative externalities of the various food systems. Only principles such as True Costs Accounting can make sure that policy decisions will have a solid basis to apply appropriate policy incentives in order to make our food systems more sustainable.

The document includes reference to “other innovations”. In this regard I wish to underline the need for assessing all kinds of innovations against the criteria of sustainability. In addition, I think it requires clarification that digitalisation, precision agriculture, biotechnology, drones, smart phone applications and many **other innovations are not approaches**. These are methods, technics or practices, which (if sustainable) are widely used and very well fit in the approach of agroecology (and other sustainable approaches). We suggest to all stakeholders to check the related literature.

We are happy that the impacts of COVID-19 is incorporated in the body of the document and not only in the annex. We agree with Brazil that we should “*build back better*”, but I would add: “*We should build back better and more sustainable*”. We also wish to emphasize that this whole process and the policy recommendations should be People-centred and Planet-sensitive.

Reflecting on the discussion so far I wish to reiterate that economic pillar of sustainability is important but we should bear in mind that economic viability or profitability is largely determined by the subsidies and policy incentives, resulting in distorted and broken food systems and leading to negative trends such as biodiversity loss, soil degradation and other sustainability issues. Economic sustainability should be achieved through appropriate policy incentives (based on True Costs Accounting), which can help orient stakeholders’ transition towards sustainable food systems.

I also wish to refer to the statement made by the distinguished representative of the US. I agree that the language and terminology should be coherent with the other processes, in particular the VG of Food Systems and Nutrition. But I think it would be essential to add that both processes should use the same recommendations to “phase out the use of antimicrobials for growth promotion”. If we want a real progress, it is not sufficient to speak about “responsible use”. Antimicrobials should be only used to treat or cure diseases of animals, plants and humans. But should definitely **not** used for the growth promotion of healthy animals. Otherwise, all our joint One Health efforts would be in useless and in vain.