United Nations System

Standing Committee on Nutrition

Meeting of the Minds on Nutrition Impact of Food Systems

Funded by the Flemish International Cooperation Agency (FICA)

Geneva, 25-28 March 2013

Contents

Executive summary

In the last two decades, the world has profoundly changed. Food and agricultural systems have evolved to become more complex and global, with longer chains from farm to fork. Nutrition is now recognized as being multi-sectoral, multi-level, multi-stakeholder and multi-disciplinary. More than 20 years after the first International Conference on Nutrition (ICN) in 1996, the second ICN (ICN2) cannot use a "business as usual" approach.

The Meeting of the Minds was organized in preparation of the ICN2 to clarify the conference's vision, discussion themes, and anticipated outcomes. Eight country case study reports examining the links between agriculture and nutrition policies, currently under preparation and funded by the Flemish and German Governments through the UNSCN, will serve as background papers for the ICN2.

The first two days of the Meeting of the Minds encouraged participants to examine the nutritional impact of policies shaping the food systems globally and in countries at different stages of the nutrition transition through different lenses (health, economy, agriculture, environment).

The next two days were devoted to assessments and analysis from 8 country teams of the nutrition transition and the role of agriculture in their countries; followed by discussion in small groups and in plenary to better understand the current and potential nutrition impact of agriculture. It was aimed to develop frameworks and to elaborate tools (policy checklist and themes per country) to be used to describe and analyze national policies in the area of food and agriculture, including trade and related sectors using a value chain approach.

Geneva, 25-28 March 2013

The Meeting of the Minds was organized by the UNSCN, as a service to the UN agencies – members of the UNSCN – to work on the preparation of the ICN2 and to also contribute to the development of the concept of nutrition-sensitive agriculture.

The four-day meeting was hosted by WHO and brought together 75 experts from international organizations, research institutions, governments and nongovernmental organizations working at global and national levels. It was ably facilitated by Jessica Fanzo and Rachel Nugent.

The meeting's concept paper, agenda and presentations are available on http://www.unscn.org/en/sessions/unscn_meetings_2013/meeting_of_the_minds.php

Executive summary (continued)

During the meeting, participants were encouraged to see the agriculture, food and nutrition work within the broader discourse of sustainability and ecosystems as well as in terms of the discourse between the agriculture/food and the nutrition/health sectors. Promising work in different institutions is occurring. Efforts are also underway in intergovernmental bodies (e.g. CFS) to stimulate dialogue and provide guidance on ways in which the agriculture and food sectors can work together to build strategies for sustainable food and nutrition systems.

Participants presented methods for engaging stakeholders and integrating nutrition-sensitive principles into agricultural policy and programming. A full understanding of changes in food consumption patterns and the implications for the food value chain is critical to support this dialogue. Transformation of the food systems can only be done in collaboration with agriculturalists, who play a fundamental role in food production. New ways of thinking and working are imperative to achieve this goal.

Suggestions for the ICN2 Steering Committee: We need to take action now, as ICN2 presents the opportunity to redefine how we do business today to catalyze change for the future. The ICN2 must clearly offer member states added value to support and advance sustainable multi-sectoral nutrition progress. The ICN2 should look now at what will be very important issues in the next 10-15 years (climate change, economic issues, water, demography, social changes). The conference should not happen in a vacuum, instead helping to set a new agenda in the context of re-igniting existing commitments for sustainable food and nutrition security for all. The ICN2 should focus on countries but at the same time consider cross-border issues to generate new thinking and acting in a way that assumes responsibility for own countries but also for the world. Participants' opinion differed concerning on the one hand the need to focus on an issue (nutrition impact of the food and agriculture systems) and on the other hand the need to pay attention to nutrition-specific issues and health. It was then suggested for the ICN2 to be reflective of a holistic approach and consolidate linkages between immediate causes (inadequate dietary intake, disease), underlying causes (food security, health services and environment, caring practices) and nutrition outcomes. Through a formal mechanism countries should be actively engaged in the agenda setting and planning of the ICN2. It is important to raise awareness to the potential differences in issues and engagements in the context of (chronic) emergencies.

Executive summary (continued)

Suggested themes/background papers: i) a mapping of declarations, commitments, treaties at different levels and for different sectors; ii) multi-sectoral coordination including justification of specific sectoral involvement; iii) dietary guidelines including the comparative analysis of agricultural value and nutritional value; iv) what brings the future: the post-2015 development agenda linking with MDG/SDG/ZHC; v) sustainable diets and food systems: what does it mean and what will it take to achieve; vi) approaching agriculture and nutrition through a gender lens; vii) providing evidence for the economic investment case in the prevention of the double burden of malnutrition; viii) identifying gaps in the nutrition workforce; (ix) describing how to scale up nutrition encompassing food security, health and WASH, in addition to provision of commodities for nutrition; (x) Food and Agriculture Systems in fragile and conflict-affected states.

Additional stakeholders to be invited: Ministers of Health, Agriculture and Finance, frontline workers, youth, communications and social media experts, and civil society.

Eight countries representing different stages of the nutrition transition presented their policy achievements and developments. In the last 18 months substantial work has been conducted to improve understanding on how food systems can be shaped to support improved health outcomes and how the agricultural sector becomes more involved. There was overall agreement that the country case studies need to serve the country needs and serve the current in-country debate with their leaders. There will be a scoping of policies with some common elements using a grid which will assess the nutrition-sensitivity of these policies. It is expected that the country case studies can be "exported" to other countries both in terms of the content of the policies as well as the institutional arrangements, and that lessons from the case studies can be widely shared. The case studies will not necessarily provide general recommendations.

Executive summary (continued)

Countries' expectations for the case studies are:

- Sierra Leone: a great opportunity to document the process of what has been done for internal and external purposes.
- Nepal: having multi-sectoral plans, there is a need to use this opportunity to review these policy documents and advance to the next stage.
- Mozambique: a need to assess existing policies in their engagement for nutrition.
- Senegal: currently uncertain that policies are inclusive enough and bring in the perspective of different sectors. This exercise will help assess their comprehensiveness.
- Brazil: this is a report for policy-makers; and a product is needed which engages with their needs.
- Malawi: the process is helpful, and there is a need to understand what is the role of the different partners. Through this case study we want to have the different partners around the table and push the nutrition agenda.
- South Africa: the buy-in from all the local stakeholders is needed.
- Thailand: there is need to do this work incorporating national priorities, adjusting to the local time-frame and with the adequate country stakeholders involved.

A format for country studies was presented which combines both the policy analysis and principles to guide the analysis towards a common structure.

Gap analysis questions were proposed to further analyze in parallel why there are gaps and what to do about them. Asking those types of questions will trigger different kinds of dialogues.

Day 1 – 25th March 2013

Welcome & opening remarks

Dr Oleg Chestnov, Assistant Director-General, World Health Organization (WHO)

The ADG highlighted the new structure of the WHO Noncommunicable Diseases and Mental Health Cluster demonstrating the importance of noncommunicable diseases. For WHO, Nutrition is important and thus also the International Conference on Nutrition (ICN2).

Ann Tutwiler, Special Representative of the Director General in Geneva, Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)

ICN2 should be used to spread the message of health outside of the health community. The ICN2 goal is to report on countries' progress since 1992; identify best practices and effective policy responses as well as working institutional arrangements.

Dr Francesco Branca (UNSCN Executive Secretary a.i.) on behalf of the Chair of the UNSCN, Ramiro Lopes da Silva

There is a need to agree on a working definition of nutrition-sensitive agriculture and identify knowledge gaps. At the end of this meeting, suggestions should be drafted for the ICN2 Steering Committee on the content and expected outcomes of ICN2. Dr Branca thanked the donors for their support to the UNSCN and especially the Flemish Government for their support of this meeting.

Dr David Nabarro, United Nations Secretary-General Special Representative for Food Security & Nutrition, Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN) Coordinator, United Nations High Level Task Force

The Framework for Scaling Up Nutrition, released in April 2010, combines an increased coverage and quality of specific interventions that are effective in improving nutrition with approaches to development within different sectors that are sensitive to the determinants of poor nutrition. The specific interventions, on their own, are not sufficient for the ensuring that people are – in the long term – better able to maintain good nutrition. The Movement for Scaling Up Nutrition, launched in September 2010, consists of 40 countries whose leaders have committed to actions that will lead to people's better nutrition. They are agreeing on targets among stakeholders, aligning different sectoral strategies so that they contribute to better nutritional outcomes, and enhancing their impact. An important challenge is to ensure that all people have year round access to adequate and affordable nutritious diets.

The continuum of under & overnutrition and the multiple burden of malnutrition and healthy diets

Dr Francesco Branca, Executive Secretary, United Nations Standing Committee on Nutrition and Director of Nutrition for Health and Development (UNSCN/WHO)

Globally the trends for the prevalence of stunting and wasting among children below 5 years of age are decreasing. However, simultaneously many countries are experiencing the double burden of malnutrition with increasing overweight and obesity (comparison of global burden of disease in 1990 and 2010). In 2010, most of the burden of disease is diet-related (most prominent dietary risks being diets low in fruits and those high in sodium). The World Health Assembly (WHA) had adopted six global targets which address the double burden of malnutrition in a comprehensive way. In May 2013, the WHA approved the Global Action Plan for the prevention of noncommunicable diseases (NCDs) and its monitoring and evaluation framework (which has nine global voluntary targets). It is important that countries continue to discuss and make decisions on goals for a healthier food supply (reduction of sugars, saturated fat and transfat; increase in unsaturated fats; reduction or increase in animal source foods).

> *"We need to understand the dietary goals and how to translate these into supply goals. This will depend on the value chains in the countries (it is context specific). The regulatory environment (changes in import policies, foreign direct investment, etc.) is facilitating an evolution of a food system in a certain direction."*
>
> *Francesco Branca*

Definition of food & nutrition security

Dr Marzella Wüstefeld, Technical Officer, United Nations Standing Committee on Nutrition Secretariat (UNSCN)

The current definition of the term Food security (FAO 1996, 2009) does not clearly spell out the nutrition dimension which is only implied to. This led to the creation of different terms to adequately express the nutrition dimension and its multisectorality. Policy makers and practitioners encounter problems due to lack of consistency in the use of these terms. In recent years the term 'Food and Nutrition Security' has become into increasingly wide-spread use as it integrates and combines both concepts food security and nutrition security linguistically and conceptually. This term greatly facilitates communications, decisions and actions that support the eradication of hunger and malnutrition in a holistic approach.

In 2012 the CFS addressed this issue in its paper 'Coming to Terms with Terminology'. Based on an in-depth review and discussions of the meaning and different uses of the terms "Food Security", "Food Security and Nutrition", "Food and Nutrition Security" and "Nutrition Security", the following definition of "food and nutrition security" was proposed to the CFS:
"Food and nutrition security exists when all people at all times have physical, social and economic access to food, which is safe and consumed in sufficient quantity and quality to meet their dietary needs and food

preferences, and is supported by an environment of adequate sanitation, health services and care, allowing for a healthy and active life."

In its CFS 39 annual session, many Member States strongly supported the use of the combined term as it best reflects the conceptual linkages between food security and nutrition security and expresses a single integrated development goal to help guide policy and programmatic action effectively. However, others did not support this approach due to various reasons. It was decided that this workstream will continue in the CFS based on priorities and available resources.

Defining Nutrition-Sensitive Development

Ms Noreen Mucha, Independent Consultant

Nutrition-sensitive development is difficult to define due to interpretations of the added value of nutrition. However, what is agreed upon is that to be "nutrition-sensitive" a sector needs to define an explicit secondary nutrition objective in which they will identify clear (output, outcome and impact) indicators and track progress along the way to measure for overall nutritional impact. According to the evidence, programs that explicitly measured nutrition from the onset of the program were successful with demonstrating nutritional outcomes. Outcome indicators to measure success of nutrition sensitivity should be objective for effective evaluation. At the country level, coordination mechanisms and planning processes, such as multisectoral nutrition coordinating bodies or integrating nutrition targets and indicators into other sectors plans and strategies can help facilitate successful nutrition-sensitive development. Countries will of course, need to integrate nutrition across sectors according to their own country context, structures and mechanisms to allow for successful nutrition-sensitive development.

The current evidence base of nutrition-sensitive agriculture and food systems

Dr Stuart Gillespie, Senior Research Fellow, International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI)

Agriculture is a key driver of poverty reduction and a major source of livelihood for nutritionally vulnerable populations. However the pathways from agriculture to nutrition are diverse and often complex. Women's empowerment is likely to be pivotal in improving the nutrition sensitivity of agriculture. Eight reviews over the last 12 years have attempted to synthesise findings from studies of agriculture-nutrition pathways and outcomes.For example, Ruel (2001) showed that projects with a well-designed behavioural change component were successful at increasing micronutrient intake, while Berti et al (2004) showed that broad-based investment in several household assets (human, financial, physical) had a greater impact than single-focus interventions. But the problem is that the evaluation designs of most individual studies were simply not good enough to be conclusive (they were not designed to measure nutrition outcomes). We need better studies, not more reviews. While there is need to be analytical as well as methodological, qualitative contextual evidence is also extremely important. In seeking to influence the agriculture sector, the nutrition community must consider to pay attention to three core domains a) knowledge and evidence, b) politics and governance, and c) capacity and resources.

The new role of industrial food processing in food systems and its impact on nutrition and health – a perspective from the South

Professor Carlos Monteiro, University of Sao Paulo

Industrial food processing is now the main shaping force of the global food system. Almost everywhere, and more rapidly in low and middle income countries, ultra-processed foods contribute to an increasing proportion of the population's diet with negative health outcomes. Food processing is defined here as a series of methods employed by the industry to convert raw foods into: i) minimally processed foods which are less perishable than unprocessed foods and often require less time and effort with preparation and cooking; or ii) processed culinary ingredients which are used in the preparation of food-based dishes and meals; or iii) ultra-processed ready-to-consume products which are essentially used to replace foods and freshly prepared food-based dishes and meals in traditional diets. Although ultra-processed foods are tasteful and convenient to consumers and highly profitable for the industry, when compared to naturally ready-to-consume foods (fruits, milk, nuts) and dishes made up from foods and culinary ingredients, they generally contribute less protein, dietary fiber, and considerably more added sugar, sodium, total, saturated and trans fats, and are more energy dense. Evidence so far indicates that the dietary share of these products is strongly related with the prevalence of obesity and other diet-related NCD. Lessons learned from breastfeeding are to be used for public actions to incentivize, support, and protect traditional food systems and diets.

> *"There is a frequent assumption that traditional diets are deficient in energy and/or nutrients. This is wrong and based on a wrong analysis of the causes of malnutrition. A role of the nutrition expert should be to analyze traditional diets and improve them if needed."*
>
> *Carlos Monteiro*

From agriculture and food systems to nutrition: pathways & principles

Dr Anna Herforth, Independent Consultant

The presentation discussed pathways from agriculture to changes in nutrition (Gillespie et al. 2012, World Bank 2007). Both household and national income are correlated with nutritional status, but the associations are variable: increased income does not necessarily lead to improved nutrition, either regarding undernutrition or overweight and NCDs (World Bank 2013). Increasing production of calories as a singular focus (mainly through starchy staples), is limited in the extent to which it can address undernutrition and even more limited in addressing obesity (World Bank 2013, Herforth 2010). Increasing production of nutrient-dense non-staple foods has potential to improve diets, both in the aggregate food system and among smallholder households. Women's empowerment (including discretionary income, time, and knowledge) and energy expenditure have strong impacts on nutrition of themselves and young children.

Management of natural resources such as water and land also affect nutrition through disease risk and productive capacity. The evidence around these pathways indicates the need for more purposeful attention to nutrition within agriculture policies and programs, to realize the full potential for agriculture to improve nutrition. There is an emerging consensus on key guiding principles for improving nutrition through agriculture, which include (1) including nutrition objectives and measurement, (2) assessing the context in program design, (3) targeting the vulnerable, (4) empowering women, (5) increasing production of diverse and nutrient-rich foods, (6) incorporating nutrition education, (7) improving food processing and preservation to make healthy foods more accessible, (8) expanding markets for the vulnerable and for nutritious foods, (9) collaborating with other sectors, and (10) maintaining the natural resource base, particularly water resources. These principles have emerged from a review of the many recently-published guidance documents on the topic, published by over a dozen development institutions (FAO 2013), and an extensive stakeholder consultation led by FAO. The presentation led to a consultation within the Meeting of the Minds on how these principles, as well as policy recommendations geared toward governments, can be implemented in future action to improve nutrition through agriculture.

Key points:

- There is a very strong political will to look at ways of linking agriculture, food systems and nutrition; this should be taken advantage of.
- In 2010, most burden of disease is diet-related.
- The six WHA global targets address the double burden of malnutrition in a comprehensive way.
- Clarity is needed on how to achieve healthy diets; there is strong recognition of the consequences for the human of either not eating enough (and being poorly nourished) or excess consumption; this becomes a subject of epidemiologically-based public health action. There will be a call for a revolution in diets for the sake of public health.
- A majority of countries agree on the definition of nutrition security. Guiding principles for nutrition-sensitive agriculture: two sets could be developed (one for programme managers, one for policy-makers). It can be useful to further reduce the number of principles to five. These principles need to become ready to fit into the policy prescription tool.
- Strong evidence for agricultural policies influencing nutrition is still scarce. It appears that ultra-processed convenience foods are contributing to the obesity epidemic.

Can nutrition-sensitivity of food and agriculture programmes and policies be measured? If so, how?

Dr James Levinson, Independent Consultant, Ag2Nut Community

The monitoring and evaluation of agricultural projects for their impact on household food insecurity and nutrition is important given the paucity of data documenting successes and failures in such projects, and because possible adverse effects in such projects need to be identified and addressed rapidly. Recognizing, however, the lack of capacity and/or reluctance of some agriculture project managers and planners to incorporate nutrition considerations in their project planning or their management information systems, a feasible alternative approach is needed – one capable of meeting agriculture-nutrition M&E objectives without encumbering project managers. One useful means may be the use of external M&E teams skilled in agriculture-nutrition linkages carrying out M&E for food security and nutrition at geographically representative sentinel sites, where baseline data are followed Data of importance includes: extent of participation, household food insecurity levels including dietary diversity, child malnutrition levels, and the identification of any harmful food security or nutrition effects. Through the creative use of separately managed sentinel site-based M&E, it should be possible to: i) generate cooperative efforts; ii) generate much needed data; and iii) generate much needed successes in nutrition-sensitive agriculture.

Agriculture Investment Policies – public and private policies towards production

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

The role of public and private agricultural investments are different. A generic policy framework for investment in agriculture was recently put forth by NEPAD through OECD. This could be adapted to serve the objectives of nutrition-sensitive agriculture. A key question is which of the enabling factors can best be used to drive agricultural supply towards quality and move us toward a healthy food investment framework? There is a noted difference between intersectoral and multi-sectoral cooperation. Multi-sectorality: public agricultural interventions + nutrition-sensitive private investments + nutrition-sensitive from other sectors. Investment priorities need to be based on locally differentiated needs and capacities.

Production systems and small holder agriculture

Dr Yurie Tanimichi Hoberg, Senior Economist, World Bank

Agriculture policy priorities/expenditures (subsidy, focus of R&D etc.) follow economic, food security, and rural livelihood (employment) considerations, typically not nutrition considerations. Horticulture has higher returns to land, and higher labor input requirements; and is driven largely by the private sector and the market. The recently published World Bank Group Agriculture Action Plan (2013-2015) has institutionalized the Bank's commitment to increase the number of agriculture projects that explicitly focus on nutrition based

on the approach of: i) invest in women; ii) improve access to the highest nutrient content foods; iii) enhance dietary diversity; and iv) incorporate explicit nutrition objectives and indicators. Increased focus on consumption (beyond sheer productivity concerns), sustainable diets and demand creation for nutritious foods is urgently needed.

Agricultural policies and nutrition in OECD countries: The old CAP and modern biofuels

Dr Josef Schmidhuber, Deputy Director, Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)

The EU CAP type policies (higher farm prices) are an ineffective means to change final consumer prices (due to a low degree of vertical price transmission). Food taxes can be effective, where there are healthy substitutes (e.g. low-sugar soft drinks). If there is a high elasticity of substitution between products, it would require only a small tax on unhealthy food or a small subsidy on the healthy food. Low income/price elasticities for food demand make general food taxes often ineffective in reducing consumption. Agricultural subsidies in developed countries have often, albeit not always, the effects of taxes on consumption. The reverse holds for agricultural policies in developing countries. The impacts of modern biofuels and biofuel policies are increasingly important. Because the energy market is very large; national biofuel subsidies do not depress food prices on world markets, but raise them. Biofuels price consumers out of the food market in poor countries. Biofuels take energy out of the supply chain, thus leave more protein (relative prices of protein will thus decline even as the absolute price levels for protein may still rise).

Trade, tariffs and markets

Mr Cedric Pene, Technical Officer, Secretariat Agriculture and Commodities Division, World Trade Organization (WTO)

So far there is little discussion in a WTO context around measures directly related to nutrition, except recently in the context of the Committee on Technical Barriers to Trade. The WTO Agreement on Agriculture comprises disciplines and commitments in the areas of market access, domestic support and export competition. The Agreement imposes limits on trade distorting policies, but preserves flexibilities especially for developing countries' Members. Multilateral trade rules are part of the policy environment influencing food supply and consumption; they need to be taken into account when designing nutrition policies.

Some thoughts for ICN2013

Professor Tim Lang, Centre for Food Policy, City University

The 20th century food system has brought: more and cheaper food, an 'efficient' agriculture, technical improvements, evidence that better food improves health, and advances in nutrition science. However,

'productionism' has created high-impact diets: on the environment (CO2, H2O, eco-systems), on health (NCDs, safety, antimicrobials, zoonoses), on society (inequalities, social determinants), on culture (ubiquity of ultra-processed foods), on the economy (de-ruralisation, jobs, profits go to processors/traders). Currently nutrition science lacks leverage: it is largely silent about the environment and is weak on culture (it is an issue for behavioural sciences). There is a wide gap between evidence, policy and behaviour. Nutrition is marginal in policy and offers split policy solutions (life sciences, social sciences, eco-nutrition). There currently is a "lock-in to consumer choice" culture: where is the evidence that consumers choose their food? Consumers "inherit" food cultures. Nutrition can contribute to a better vision of Progress. "Big picture" coherence is needed: what is a good diet and a good food system? Sustainable dietary guidelines are needed as current dietary guidelines are "environment-blind" and ICN provides an opportunity to reflect on this. ICN should address the problem of (un)sustainable diets. The UK Sustainable Development Commission 2011 report proposed sustainability as a complex set of 'poly-values': Quality, Environment, Economy, Social Values, Health, and Governance.

> *"ICN 2013 is the right time/place to: i) revise the global vision for food policy; ii) reconnect nutrition with other disciplines; iii) offer solutions to the problem of agriculture; iv)face real consumer, commercial and cultural problems; v) champion a perspective that addresses consumer choice: what is s a good sustainable diet?"*
>
> *Tim Lang*

Nutrition's role in the sustainability negotiations

Dr Barbara Burlingame, Senior Nutrition Advisor, Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)

Diets, the environment and agriculture are not sustainable. Definition of sustainable diets (FAO, 2010): Sustainable Diets are those diets with low environmental impacts which contribute to food and nutrition security and to a healthy life for present and future generations. Sustainable diets are protective and respectful of biodiversity and ecosystems, culturally acceptable, accessible, economically fair and affordable; nutritionally adequate, safe and healthy; while optimizing natural and human resources. Biodiversity is considered at three different levels: the ecosystem, the species within the ecosystem, and the genetic diversity within species. Genetic uniformity of crops is increasing (e.g. rice in Thailand: in the past there were 16,185 different varieties, now 37 and 50% of the area is cultivated using only two varieties). Sustainability of environments is explicitly linked to nutrition. It needs to be featured in ICN2.

Health in a green economy: a focus on agricultural policies

Dr Carlos Dora, Coordinator, World Health Organization (WHO)

The speaker shared experience of looking at the IPCC policy recommendations with a Health-in-the Green-Economy-impact-assessment lens. This implies assessing the health benefits and risks of those IPCC policies. Four sectors were used as examples to illustrate the assessment process: the transport sector, health facilities, household energy sector and agricultural sector. Concerning the agricultural sector IPCC recommendations, the risks related to health were mapped and included: NCDs, occupational risks, pesticides, antibiotic resistance, vector-borne diseases etc. and these were mapped against the IPCC policies (which were only proposing to address CO2 emissions). Five important lessons learned/recommendations were shared: (i) conduct a thorough assessment, systematically documenting the risks and benefits (not only short term but also long-term); (ii) the WHO Guidelines Review Committee is useful for assessing the weight of the available evidence and clarifying conflict of interest issues; (iii) ensure that policies are understood and mapped; (iv) also include a systematic equity analysis; and (v) do not be misguided by the tendancy/need to focus on "the magic bullet" – in case of health impact assessments the broad social, cultural and environmental context needs to be considered.

Day 2 – 26th March 2013

Opening remarks

Dr Francesco Branca, Executive Secretary, United Nations Standing Committee on Nutrition (UNSCN)

The first day of the meeting set the scene by briefly exploring the epidemiology of the double burden of malnutrition, defining food and nutrition security and building an understanding of the intricate pathways and principles which link agriculture and nutrition. Presentations in the afternoon demonstrated population-level policy interventions such as agricultural investment policies, agriculture subsidies, and smallholder investment for improved nutrition outcomes. Sustainability of food systems and the importance of nutritionally diverse diets stimulated rigorous discussion.

Applying food supply and value-chain concepts for achieving positive nutrition outcomes

Dr Corinna Hawkes, Head of Policy & Public Affairs, World Cancer Research Fund

Food supply chains have changed considerably over past decades. While the basic steps in the chain are the same, the actors and processes in the chain have changed, as have their relative importance, power and scale. Increasingly, food supply chains are seen as "value chains" which are concerned not just with creating and moving a product to market, but creating value for the actors in the chain. "Value chains" have become an important framework for agricultural development i.e. identifying how value can be created for the poor and vulnerable involved in supplying food. Designed in the right way, value chain approaches also have the potential to improve nutritional outcomes. At the moment, there is a significant degree of incoherence between nutritional goals and the policies that influence the food supply. There is also insufficient action to lever sectors outside of health to improve nutrition. Value chain approaches could help overcome these challenges by identifying how food availability, affordability and nutritional quality could be improved at

different points in the supply chain, while also creating economic value for value chain actors. Value chain approaches could be developed to consider both the role of food supply and demand in nutritional problems, and to explicitly identify multi sectoral, coordinated solutions.
Key issues for the future include;

- Development of supportive and coherent policies which encourage better diets for consumers in the context of the food supply chain;
- Enhancement of policies to lever the entire food supply chain and enhance nutrition aspects of food;
- Focus on leveraging value chain development in agriculture for nutrition; and
- Focus on food systems rather than solely on agriculture alone.

Principles for multisectoral approaches for improving nutrition

Dr James Garrett, Sr. Research Fellow, IFPRI

There is broad agreement that improving nutrition requires working simultaneously and in coordinated ways across multiple sectors, especially food and agriculture, health, environmental services, and education. Country experiences now show that, although difficult, it is possible to work multisectorally, not just "think"multisectorally while maintaining sectoral silos. These country experiences provide insights into the approaches needed to deal with the political and institutional challenges of multisectoral collaboration. . A conceptual model of the internal and external factors to consider in working multisectorally was presented. The presentation noted that the needed collaboration can express itself in different ways, including networking, cooperation, coordination, integration. It highlighted the importance of sustained commitment by the highest political authorities to action on nutrition (and so creation of policy space) while also recognizing that success requires strong management skills and leadership across various levels, not just at the top.

Food environment- consumer access to food

Professor Boyd Swinburn, Population Nutrition and Global Health in the School of Population Health, University of Auckland

There is an increase of chronic disease risk factors relating to food and nutrition (high blood pressure and BMI are listed in the top 3 risk factors among 18 of the 21 sub-regions of the world) however there has been little progress on creating healthier food environments. WHO targets and monitoring frameworks have been established; however, achieving modest progress on obesity will not occur without implementing major changes to food policies and environments. There is increased obesity awareness in the last ten years, however Governments are slow to react and are opting for non-regulatory action. In contrast, the food industry argues predominantly for voluntary actions. Moving forward, actions in policy-making, monitoring and evaluation, governance and accountability must be intensified. The International Network for Food and Obesity/NCD Research, Monitoring and Action Support (INFORMAS) has been established to monitor and benchmark these actions. Created by a global network of public-interest researchers and NGOs, the objectives are to monitor, benchmark and support public and private sector actions to create healthier food environments to support the reduction of obesity and NCDs. Currently agriculture policies are small parts of 'Public Sector' and 'Food Trade and Investment' modules. The speaker supports the need for an Intergovernmental Panel on Sustainable Diets (IPSD) and suggests it could be a focus of the ICN2.

> *"There is increased obesity awareness in the last ten years, however Governments are slow to react, opting for non-regulatory action whereas the food industry is fast to move through self-governed voluntary actions."*
>
> *Boyd Swinburn*

Incentives for the Private Sector to improve nutrition: STICK or CARROT?

Dr Marti Van Liere, Director, Nutritious Foods for Children and Mothers, Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition (GAIN)

How do we incite private sector to contribute to improving nutrition? The stick approach includes regulatory frameworks that ensure that industry complies with policies. Two examples of the carrot approach are given : (1) The WHO Global Strategy on Diet and Physical Activity prompted Unilever (and other food companies) to conduct nutrient profiling and create nutrient criteria to guide product reformulation and future product development; (2) the Access To Nutrition Index (ATNI) rates food and beverage companies on their nutrition policies and aims to stimulate dialogue with global food companies on how they can improve nutrition related practices.
Open dialogue, being inclusive and using both carrot and stick is recommended to engage the private sector towards more nutrition-focused business strategies.

Project Forum:
Barbara Burlingame (FAO) presented FAO's Nutrition Division
Dudley Tarlton (UNDP) shared information on a recently held nine country Pacific Islands meeting on Trade and NCDs
Patrick Kolsteren presented results of the SUNRAY Nutrition research in Africa project
Stuart Gillespie presented Transform Nutrition, the CGIAR A4NH programme and the LANSA programme
Yuri Tanamichi Hoberg provided information on the Secure Nutrition platform
Milla McLachlan presented the Southern African Food Lab

Food losses and waste - A key issue for nutrition

Dr Barbara Burlingame, Senior Nutrition Advisor, Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)

The concept of household waste in an importing country being a natural resource waste in an exporting country was explained. In developed countries food waste is the highest at the level of consumption compared to developing countries where it is predominantly in agriculture or post-harvest. Waste through over-consumption is an important concept (for example: 1 kg body fat = 32200 kJ = 2.6 kg wheat). The

speaker noted that adding value through fortification should be considered a secondary priority, to the prevention of nutrient losses during processing. Efforts to reduce food losses and waste, including over-consumption, will significantly reduce the burden of agriculture on natural resources. Participants were reminded of global food consumption patterns and the concept of frugality as highlighted in the new Mediterranean Diet pyramid and through millennia in traditional food systems. Food waste dietary guidelines were re-presented as they were established by the US Food Administration nearly a century ago. Rather than increasing value by adding nutrients, future innovation should focus on reducing nutrient loss at all stages of the food supply chain. Our focus should not be "adding value" through nutrient fortification, but rather preventing nutrient losses along supply and production chains, as integral to all campaigns on food losses and waste.

> *"Not "adding value" with nutrients, but rather preventing losses and waste, including nutrient losses, along supply chains must be considered."*
>
> *Barbara Burlingame*

Is a Healthy diet economically sustainable? The health effects of prevention policies

Dr Franco Sassi, Senior Health Economist, Health Division, Directorate for Employment, Labour and Social Affairs, Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)

In any given moment, obese patients cost more than normal weight patients however cost less from a life perspective due to their significantly lower life-expectancy. Obesity accounts for 1 to 3% of total health expenditure in most countries and up to 10% in the US. A review on various policy intervention packages for chronic disease prevention was presented, differentiating in options for OECD and emerging economies. It is clear that obesity prevention saves lives, is a good investment, and has the ability to reduce health inequalities (larger benefits for those most at risk). It was concluded that obesity and noncommunicable diseases are global economic issues which can be tackled and prevention is considered good value for money. Comprehensive intersectoral prevention strategies are the most cost-effective as they generate the largest health gains for a given amount of resources spent.

Ecomic sustainability: Impacts of moving towards a 'healthy diet'

Dr Linda Fulponi, Senior Economist, Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)

AGLINK COSIMO, an econometric model of the agricultural sector was used to measure impacts of a package of NCD prevention interventions on agricultural commodity output, consumption and trade projections over the next 10 years. Two scenarios were evaluated: Scenario 1: Reduction in total fat consumption following a comprehensive prevention strategy; and Scenario 2:application of WHO dietary guideline target of saturated fat consumption of 10% or less of total calories. The analysis finds that there were only very limited effects on world markets for beef, dairy, vegetable oils and coarse grains, in terms of prices, consumption, production and trade. This means that efforts to move consumption towards ''healthier diets' should be economically sustainable over the medium and long term.

Economic impacts of better food and nutrition policy

Dr Paul Thomassin, Associate Professor in Agriculture Economics. McGill University

An integrated economic model using current data to inform policy makers was presented. Described as a market transformation model, it is dynamic as it allows interaction at different stages of the system, therefore the effects of changes in policies and regulations can be evaluated using a feedback system. Macroeconomic impacts of a "Healthy Diet" were assessed in Canada and a comparison was made between the actual and the required consumption of three food categories: fruits and vegetables, dairy products, and meats for two different scenarios of consumption. The overall economic impact on the economy from adopting a healthy diet strategy is positive for Canada. The impact on individual industrial sectors will vary and almost all countries in trade agreements with Canada benefit as well from Canada adopting a healthier diet. It was concluded that a portfolio of policies has greatest population health outcomes; health economists need to move beyond the cost-effectiveness of interventions, and evaluate impacts on the macro-economic environment.

The International Conference on Nutrition 1992: How it was prepared, what was achieved and lessons learned

Dr Chizuru Nishida, Coordinator, World Health Organization (WHO)

The 1992 ICN was prompted by knowledge that there was in fact sufficient food to feed the world to reduce all forms of malnutrition. It was widely accepted that noncommunicable diseases were increasing among both developed and developing countries. A sophisticated process at country, regional and global level was conducted to prepare for the conference and contributed to the main conference paper 'World Declaration and Plan of Action for Nutrition' which pledged key global nutrition related actions. Although there was political commitment, progress towards these actions varied in regions. Obstacles and challenges faced by countries were political instability, limited resources, and lack of political and financial commitment.

Joint FAO/WHO Second International Conference on Nutrition (ICN2)

Brian Thompson, Technical Officer, Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)

ICN2 background, rationale, purpose, scope, key objectives and expected outcomes were presented. Scope, key objectives and expected outcomes were shared. The process leading up to the ICN2 was explained including the country case studies. The ICN2 comprises of a Technical Preparatory Meeting (13-15 November 2013) and a High Level ICN2 Conference (19-21 November 2014). The ICN2 will address all forms of malnutrition, recognizing the nutrition transition and its consequences and will bring food, agriculture and health together to improve nutrition.

Key points:

- A key challenge in understanding the role of the supply chain in nutrition: is it driven by supply from producers or demand from consumers?
- For monitoring and benchmarking, the International Network for Food and Obesity/NCD Research, Monitoring and Action Support (INFORMAS) has been established. It is a global network of public-interest researchers and NGOs that aims to monitor, benchmark and support public and private sector actions to create healthy food environments and reduce obesity and NCDs.
- Open dialogue, being inclusive and using both carrot and stick is recommended to incentivize the private sector.
- Rather than increasing value by adding nutrients, future innovation should focus on reducing nutrient loss at all stages of the food supply chain.
- Obesity prevention saves lives, is a good investment, and can reduce health inequalities.
- There are limited effects on world markets of a move to ''healthier diets' which implies that such changes should be economically sustainable over the medium and long term.
- Health economists need to move beyond the cost-effectiveness of interventions, and evaluate impacts on the macro-economic environment.

Day 3 – 27th March 2013

Opening remarks

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

The second day of the meeting provided stimulating discussions about multi-sectoral and sustainable approaches to improved nutrition and health outcomes. Policy intervention examples were presented with a focus on food supply and value chains. There was passionate debate about whether the private sector (mainly referring to the food industry) cares about the nutritive value of foods they produce and their level of engagement with food reformulation. Economic modeling presented how various nutrition promotion packages effect various economic sectors, and highlights the commitment that economists have in becoming part of the dialogue to influence policy. Reflection on ICN 1992 highlighted that there are many areas of nutrition which must be considered to work towards meaningful nutrition outcomes. It was discussed that lessons from ICN 1992 must be considered in the planning of ICN2, to strengthen the political willpower and raise the profile of nutrition globally.

The NEPAD CAADP Nutrition Capacity Development Process

Ms Bibi Giyose, Advisory, Food and Nutrition Security, The New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD)

Ms Charlotte Dufour, Technical Officer, Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)

NEPAD, with technical support from FAO, is leading the "CAADP Nutrition Capacity Development Initiative" whereby multi-sectoral country teams led by CAADP focal points develop action plans for mainstreaming nutrition in national agriculture investment plans during sub-regional workshops[1]. This initiative, implemented in collaboration with the Regional Economic Commissions and supported by numerous development partners, is helping build ownership of nutrition in the agriculture sector and strengthen linkages between agriculture/CAADP and multi-stakeholder coordination nutrition mechanisms such as SUN and REACH. But there are significant challenges in implementing recommendations due to the need to further build political commitment for nutrition in agriculture, and to limited capacities in assessment, design, implementation and monitoring and evaluation of agriculture interventions with enhanced nutritional impact. Efforts are underway to leverage existing investments and to mobilize additional financial, human and technical resources to support the mainstreaming of nutrition in agriculture investments,"

[1] West Africa workshop in Dakar, in November 2011 – 17 countries; East and Central Africa workshop in Dar-es-Salam in February 2013 – 18 countries; Southern Africa upcoming in September 2013 in Gaborone -14 countries

Planned policy analysis work in countries

Assistant Professor Jessica Fanzo, Columbia University Medical Centre

Professor David Pelletier, Cornell University

The objective of this exercise is to appreciate how to practically apply improved nutrition through food and agriculture across demographics and geographies. The country case studies should highlight areas where there are gaps in the knowledge and focus on areas of development. The policy checklist working group noted that consultants should follow a structured process to:

- review the national food system as it relates to nutrition (including although not exclusively: trade, production and consumption trends);
- identify if there is a national nutrition action plan and national dietary guidelines and comment on integration with the agriculture sector;
- identify key stakeholders through in-depth interviewing to obtain insights; and
- collate and review all relevant policies as they apply to nutrition using the Agriculture & Nutrition 10 guiding principles.

Stages of nutrition transition

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

There are four proposed stages of the nutrition transition: pre-transitional (low income), transitional (low and middle income), post-transitional (high income). These are not necessarily natural in their development or progression. There are many indicators to indicate chronic disease risk, agricultural conditions, and health policy and food systems.

Country presentations

Mozambique

Mr Almeida Tembe, Technical Officer, Secretariado Técnico de Segurança Alimentar e Nutricional (SETSAN)

National data revealed that 35% of children below 5 years suffer from chronic food insecurity and 44% from chronic undernutrition. This prompted the government to create an integrated food and nutrition strategy. This is incorporated into economic and social activities and implemented within different sectors of government.

Brazil

Ms Mariana Helcias Cortes, Policy Advisor, Secretariat of National Health Fund (FNS), Ministry of Social Development and Fight Against Hunger in Brazil

Brazil suffers from the double burden of malnutrition and although the prevalence of stunting and undernutrition among children below 5 years is decreasing, overweight, obesity and noncommunicable diseases are becoming more prevalent. Concurrently there is a decrease in the use of traditional diets and an increase in the consumption of ultra-processed foods. In 2006, Brazil developed a food and nutritional

security law (see box below); this legal framework was further built upon to initiate a Zero Hunger program (SISAN) with the objective to ensure that the right for all Brazilians to eat 3 meals per day is fulfilled. There are many programs operating to improve nutritional outcomes for Brazilians at a federal, state and local level, using the food value chain approach incorporating and connecting local production, purchase and consumption. It is important to note that all programs are controlled locally.

> *"Food and nutritional security is the effectiveness of the right to regular and permanent access to a sufficient amount of quality food, without compromising the access to other basic needs, based on healthy practices which respect cultural diversity and are culturally, economically, environmentally and socially sustainable"*
>
> Art. 3º of the Brazilian Food and Nutritional Security Law, September 15th, 2006)

Sierra Leone

Ms Aminata Koroma, National Nutrition Program Manager, Ministry of Health, Sierra Leone

Mr Mohamed Sheriff, Assistant Director, Planning, Evaluation, Monitoring and Statistics Division, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Food Security, Sierra Leone

The double burden of malnutrition in Sierra Leone is high with 75% of the population depending on markets to access food. Sixty three percent of household expenditure is on food which highlights vulnerability to food price volatility. Key learnings include:

- A multisectoral approach works. Agriculture and health can work and plan together.
- Governments can accept ownership and commit financial support.
- Communication to policy makers should be in a language they understand.
- High level global advocacy works because governments want to be seen to do the right thing.
- Coordination mechanism is within the national framework, aligning government, partner and donor strategies on nutrition and food security.
- Technical assistance is important at country level for effective program implementation.

Malawi

Mrs Edith Mkawa (Permanent Secretary, Office of the President for Nutrition and HIV) and Agnes Mgomezulu (Ministry of Agriculture Extension Services)

Malawi has a population of whom 80% live in rural areas. Approximately 50% of the population is below 15 years of age and the country is dependent on agriculture for economic growth. The double burden of malnutrition is present and there is a high prevalence of micronutrient deficiencies as well. The government is committed to improving nutrition related health outcomes and the national nutrition policy and strategy is currently under revision. Key learnings include:

- Linking nutrition to national economy is a strong advocacy tool when communicating with government and has helped build the business case for nutrition to be included in the country's development.
- Development of resources educating policy makers on the food groups and importance of dietary diversity has assisted with government commitment.
- Political issues affect the implementation of nutrition programs.
- Emphasis should be placed on stakeholders in the planning process.

Senegal

Dr Abdoulaye Ka, National Coordinator, Cellule de Lutte la Malnutrition, Senegal

Acute malnutrition, stunting, micronutrient deficiencies, and obesity are prevalent in Senegal. Formal policy documents are currently being revised and private sector, local government, health, agriculture, trade and social affairs are involved in food and nutrition security strategy planning. It is critical that implementation is through local government. Key learnings include:

- Nutrition must be on the development agenda.
- Interventions must be based on globally recognized evidence.
- Intervention at 6 months is an important entry point to reduce the prevalence of malnutrition through appropriate complementary feeding.

South Africa

Professor Hettie Schonfeldt, Independent Consultant

South Africa is a middle income country with a dualistic agro-food system. Majority of households live in poverty with limited dietary diversity: eating a healthy diet would cost each South African 2.5$/day whereas 0.60$ per day is available. The double burden of malnutrition is very present and can even be observed within the same households. In the future, South Africa would benefit from:

- National food consumption data.
- Alignment and coordination among nutrition and agriculture sectors.
- Government monitoring of national food prices.

Thailand

Professor Emorn Wasantwisut, University of Mahidol

Thailand is an agro-industrial country with a strong export economy while experiencing rapid nutrition in transition. Historically, undernutrition and stunting were prevalent which led to the nationwide implementation of poverty alleviation and primary health care programs. The country succeeded in having macro- and micro-level policies support each other at community level, resulting in significant declines of maternal and child malnutrition. With rapid economic growth and changes in diet (consumption of rice, cereals, tubers and fish is decreasing, that of meat, eggs and milk increasing) and lifestyle, the prevalence of obesity and non-communicable diseases has increased. The recent strategic framework for food management in Thailand proposes a multi-sectoral approach to implement the national food strategy through thematic focus on food security; food quality and safety; food education and management system.

Nepal

Dr Raj Kumar Pokharel, Chief Nutritionist, Ministry of Health Nutrition Section, Child Health Division, Department of Health Services, Nepal

Nepal is a small but diverse country challenged by harsh geographical terrain and limited infrastructure. The reduction in maternal undernutrition is accompanied by an increased prevalence of obesity. Overall, stunting is decreasing, however nutritional inequities are wide. Although there is a 65% reduction in stunting amongst the richest quintile, there is a 12% increase in stunting amongst the poorest quintile. Eighty percent of households are consuming adequately iodized salt nationally and the prevalence of visible goiter has eliminated. But there are discrepancies between rural and urban populations due to limited access to iodized salt. The coverage of semi-annual Vitamin A supplementation to children under five years age has been consistently more than 90% over last 5 years period. Coverage and compliance of iron/folic acid supplementation to pregnant women is increasing but anemia is high (70%) among children 0-23 months. Numbers of nutrition specific interventions are underway of scaling-up through health sector. Multi-sectoral interventions to improve nutrition status include education for income, child cash grant, school feeding, flood recovery, child protection and fortified food distribution. Food sovereignty as a fundamental right has been included in the interim constitution and priority has been given to food security in three-year plans.

Day 4 – 28th March 2013

Country cases group work feedback

Sierra Leone and Malawi

The case study should provide an answer to the question: What are the critical points in food system amenable to policy influences to improve nutrition. For that it is important to look at:

- What are the key nutrition problems?
- The multi-sectoral causes of these nutrition problems: which ones relate to food systems (value chains)?
- Which causes need intervention from other sectors?
- What food system components could be improved to impact on the nutrition problems identified?
- What policies, strategies could support these improvements?

The added value of the case study is that it should document the nutrition-sensitive agriculture policy planning that has happened and review the country planning using secondary data rather than primary data. The contribution to the ICN2 will be to share country examples of good practice, country planning processes and lessons learnt from the challenges faced.

Senegal and Nepal

Senegal: The situation analysis of policies and public sector investments is very important (using a participatory approach for the analysis). There are many policies but they are not well linked. The case study should provide an answer to what the gaps and linkages are and what could be the triggers to better link those policies. The food consumption analysis according to urban/rural, income groups, geographic areas – and domestic trade and distribution is very useful. The multi-sectoral approach used in Senegal needs to be documented so that it can be shared with other countries.

Nepal: There is a shift in the production from food crops to cash crops and an analysis of the agricultural system is needed. Secondly, rice consumption is increasing and replacing more traditional cereal crops, creating a "rice hunger". In addition, the government is providing rice to districts suffering from chronic hunger. The rice distribution system needs to be analysed. Food prices are very high because of the large number of middle men (long food chains). There is need to add policies specifically for "hard-to-reach" areas. With regard to checklist 4 (analysis of constraints and opportunities), resources for infrastructure need to be added in the analysis.

Mozambique and Brazil

For both countries, the objectives of the case studies were discussed, each of the country's specifics and the process of working. Both Brazil and Mozambique are interested in mapping existing policies and identifying gaps, using the 10 guiding principles with focus on poverty reduction and social inequalities. Brazil wants to find out what the barriers are in communicating with the Ministry of Agriculture (there is a Ministry of Agriculture as well as a Ministry of Agrarian Development), and propose a way forward on how to address these barriers. Mozambique proposes to specifically look at smallholder agriculture, using 3 principles for

analysis: official government policies, donor-funded programmes (within the scope of government policies), and descriptions of the programmes in more detail. For both countries it is important to team up with local players to form a national team.

South Africa and Thailand

This group discussed general principles for the case studies including:

- Purpose of the case studies should be to address priority knowledge gap in the country – and provide insights for other countries
- Country teams should lead and own the case study, country teams should identify if and when and where and what external support is needed
- Looking not only in the past but also to the future and focus on the food system we want to create (do countries know what type of food system is aimed for?)
- The process is important
- Strive for rigor, best available evidence, triangulate data from different sources
- Demonstrate leadership by documenting what works and what has failed

Plenary on the country case studies

Country level policy analysis work is a scoping exercise to assess nutrition-sensitivity of policies which could include, but is not limited to, trade, production and consumption trends, governance arrangements, agricultural guidelines, dietary guidelines, and nutrition plans of action. Linkages with social protection programs created to support these policies could be looked at as well. The interface with program examples, could be highlighted e.g., details on social protection programs in Brazil, using the value chain approach to incorporate local production, and access. It might be helpful to include examples of specific programs and how these may or may not be nutrition-sensitive.

It was also emphasized that policy decisions taken in one country can have a profound (nutrition) impact in other (neighboring) countries. Food systems can be local or global impacting beyond boundaries.

The country case studies should be country-owned and country-led and allow to identifying the gaps: (i) agriculture and food policies on that are/not nutrition sensitive; why? How? What to do? (using policy checklist and guiding principles); and analyze in parallel (ii) Nutrition-sensitive agriculture and food policies that are not (sufficiently) implemented; why? How? What to do? (iii) Agriculture /food programmes, projects from donors/NGOs that are either nutrition-sensitive or are not done outside the Government policy and budget and control; why? How? What to do? (iv) National M&E framework regarding all the above; and (v) Governance arrangements and effectiveness; why? How? What to do?

The next round of FAO regional conferences will take place in early 2014. These meetings, attended by Ministry of Agriculture Ministers and staff, can be used to further present the case studies and thus increase the sense of Agriculture also "owning" Nutrition.

Key points:

- The feedback from the country case study group work revealed some tension between the request to have the case studies as an element for the ICN2 vs. having the case studies as an opportunity for the countries to move their policy agendas. This tension was resolved by saying that on the one hand we need a common basis for the case studies which will be scoping the policies and looking at the institutional processes and, on the other hand, we need an understanding of what could be the good practices and highlighting some additional elements in each of the case studies. So countries first take stock of what is happening and help the in-country dialogue, but the ICN2 will benefit from this: further amplify this dialogue. The case studies provide an opportunity to cross-fertilize experiences between countries. The ICN2 will then feedback to the countries and hopefully this will help to change the way of doing business. Countries' expectations are:
    - Sierra Leone: A great opportunity to document the process of what has been done for internal and external purposes.
    - Nepal: We have multisectoral plans and we need to use this opportunity to review these policy documents and advance to the next stage
    - Mozambique: We need to assess existing policies in their engagement for nutrition
    - Senegal: We are not sure that sure that our policies are inclusive enough and bring in the perspective of different sectors. So this exercise will help assessing the comprehensiveness.
    - Brazil: This is a report for policy makers, otherwise there is no point in doing this work. We need a product which engages with their language and their needs.
    - Malawi: The process is helpful, we need to understand what is the role of the different partners. Through this case study we want to have the different partners around the table and push the nutrition agenda.
    - South Africa: If we do this, we need to have the buy-in from all the local stakeholders.
    - Thailand: we need to do this incorporating our own priorities, time-frame and with the adequate country stakeholders involved.
- A guidance table was presented which combines both the policy analysis and principles aimed to structure the analysis in a coherent way.
- Gap analysis questions were proposed to further analyze in parallel why there are gaps and what to do about them. Asking those types of questions will trigger different kinds of dialogues.

Project Forum:
Alan Dangour (LSHTM): online free open educational resource: Programming for Nutrition Outcomes, funded by DFID available http://ble.lshtm.ac.uk/course/view.php?id=26 . It is a Masters level course with 17 sessions, including on agriculture and health.

Groupwork on ICN2

The group noted that the context of the ICN2 has changed compared to the ICN'92: countries' ownership and strong participation is instrumental; nutrition has become an important global issue and there is a different way of agenda setting (with the Paris, Accra, Busan declarations among many others). The group considered that there is need to redefine how to do business today in order to change the future. However, the conference should not happen in a vacuum but should help to set a new agenda in the context of re-igniting existing commitments for sustainable food and nutrition security for all. The group's suggested themes for background papers include: i) a mapping of declarations, commitments, treaties at different levels and for different sectors; ii) multi-sectoral coordination including providing the arguments why a certain sector needs to be involved; iii) dietary guidelines including the comparative analysis of agricultural value and nutritional value; iv) what brings the future: the post-2015 development agenda linking again MDS/SDG/ZHC; v) sustainable diets and food systems: what does it mean and what will it take to achieve; vi) looking at agriculture and nutrition through a gender lens; and vii) providing evidence for the economic investment case to prevent both undernutrition as well as overweight/obesity. For the 2014 political meeting it is important to ensure multi-sectoral buy-in at ministerial and Heads of Government level and identify a process for it. The group's suggestions on stakeholders are: importance of civil society, including farmer's organizations, private sector including small and medium enterprises and others (CGIAR group, Research organizations, foundations, IUNS). ICN2 should result in a signed declaration (but who should sign?); it is suggested to build on existing commitments instead of developing new ones and have a reasonable set of expectations as well as clarity on the processes and resources for implementation. Finally, a simple system of monitoring progress for accountability is needed.

"For the ICN2 we need to be forward-looking and put the past behind us. Let's create something that builds energy and will not sap energy!"

Milla McLachlan

Plenary on the ICN2

Participants provided further suggestions and comments. The ICN2 should look now at what will be very important issues in the next 10-15 years (climate change, economic issues, water, demography, social changes). It is recommended to have a better alignment with the Paris and Busan declarations: to truly listen

to the people who are currently struggling with malnutrition – and how they see the future and their own future in particular. It is important to raise awareness to the potential differences in issues and engagements in the context of (chronic) emergency. There are currently 42 fragile and conflicted states and several of these are heavily dependent on agriculture. One concrete way to do so is to expand the country case studies as they are currently in primarily stable environments and therefore not representative of global dynamics, even though the selection was meant to be based on "different stages of the nutrition transition". Since the case study reports will serve as background papers for the ICN2, additional examples could focus on emergency and crisis contexts.

For the ICN2 there were different opinions among participants: on the one hand the need to focus on an issue (the food and agriculture systems); on the other hand the need to also pay attention to nutrition-specific issues and health. It was suggested for ICN2 preparations to be reflective of a holistic approach and consolidate linkages between immediate causes (inadequate dietary intake, disease), underlying causes (food security, health services and environment, caring practices) and nutrition outcomes (over nutrition and under nutrition). Social protection policies and programs (social safety nets, classroom education) need to be incorporated with a nutrition lens.

Additional background paper themes: identifying the gap in the nutrition workforce; describing how to scale up nutrition encompassing food security, health and WASH, in addition to provision of commodities for nutrition; Food and Agriculture Systems in fragile and conflict-affected states.

Additional stakeholders to be invited to participate: Ministers of Finance, frontline workers, youth, communications and social media experts. It will be important to figure out the process to get a truly multi-sectoral conference. Let's learn from Brazil and ensure engagement of civil society.

Key points on ICN2:

- Focus on countries but at the same time consider cross-border issues to generate new thinking and acting in a way that assumes responsibility for own countries but also for the world.
- Create country categories not only according to poverty, undernutrition, but als according to transition stage (in the context of their food system) and agriculture growth and diversity.
- Through a formal mechanism countries should be actively engaged in the agenda setting and planning of the ICN2.
- Focus on capacity strengthening: a well-trained workforce needs to implement the different action plans.
- The Right to Food dimension should be taken into account in the preparation of the upcoming meetings.
- Although malnutrition problems are complex and involve a lot of different issues, there needs to be a focus. This should be on "Food and Agricultural Systems and what they can contribute to reduce the burden of malnutrition". A Food/Ag lens needs to be used to address this, otherwise the ICN2 will cover everything and nothing.
- ICN2 should pressure governments to invest in nutrition, as the funding gap is so large.
- It is important for countries to be strong , but we live in a regionalized and globalized world, so paying attention to cross-border issues is really important. We need to think and act in a way that assumes responsibility not only for our own but for the world. This will become a major issue in the years ahead and therefore we need to change how we operate.

Key findings – wrap up

Dr Francesco Branca (UNSCN Executive Secretary a.i.)

On the first day there was the need to scope current knowledge on different aspects of the policy environment focusing on the supply side of the food system overall. Different elements related to agricultural inputs were looked at including investments, and other areas that condition the availability of food. On the second day the demand side of the food system was looked at. The concept of the food value chains was explained and the institutional arrangements to govern food systems were discussed. How can we better describe the food chain, and what are the determinants of the food environment e.g. in terms of trade? Participants tried to understand the connection between the current epidemiological situation and the

nutrition priorities and the interventions to address them from an economic perspective. The economic case for changes in the food system was looked at and it was shown that it is economically feasible and profitable to make changes towards a healthier diet. There is now a good understanding of the boundaries of the policies that should be looked at. It is clear that we should not only be looking at production but also at the food system as a whole. This helped to formulate ideas around what to work on with the country case studies.

There were very good presentations from the eight countries about their policy achievements and developments. In the last 18 months a lot has been happening around the understanding on how the food system can be shaped to make it more nutrition-friendly and what the agricultural sector can do to improve nutrition. The countries are at different stages of the nutrition transition and an interesting way of assessing the stage of the nutrition transition was provided. Each stage of the nutrition transition has its own types of priorities; each stage has its challenges in terms of policy environment and will have to be analyzed in a different way, but there are common elements. These are the guiding principles for nutrition-sensitive agriculture, which have evolved during this meeting (addressing different audiences and condensed further and operationalized). Thanks to intense but constructive discussions, the objectives and methodology of the country case studies became more concrete. There was overall agreement that the country case studies need to serve the country needs and serve the current in-country debate with their leaders. It is a step in a process. There will be a scoping of policies with some common elements using a grid which will assess the nutrition-sensitivity of these policies. The country case studies can be "exported" to other countries both in terms of the content of the policies as well as the institutional arrangements. There will be lessons learned that can be disseminated. The case studies will not necessarily provide general recommendations; since much information will be obtained through secondary sources; we have to validate and use a scientific approach to describe and report the information. At the same time the case studies will help to identify gaps which might then be addressed by other complementary processes more scientifically-driven. More work is needed on the concept of nutrition-sensitive food systems. A definition is needed what is evidence-based and what remains in the domain of plausibility.

The ICN2 will be a step in the movement for making the food system more nutrition-friendly. The common expectation is that it will produce a political outcome that then can be usefully fed back into the countries. The ICN2 might change the way in which policy makers select their priorities and Ministers of Finance allocate their resources. It will be a way to identify a set of priority policy packages, and a way to create a global platform for negotiation, policy elements which need to be looked at across countries beyond boundaries.

Dr Ann Tutwiler, Special Representative of the Director General in Geneva, Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)

Referring to the previous speaker, the need for a movement that is focused on the entire population was underlined; the ICN2 should be seen as a process of building a movement and not just as a conference. Each element of the food security framework needs to be looked at with a nutrition hat on (not just with a food security hat on). During this meeting the stability pillar was not looked at: if children are deprived at certain critical points it can have big long term impacts. Another important issue is the notion of co-benefits: there is need to understand those better both to expand the universe of people that is going to support the movement but also to look at how we can work with others in a technical way. Concerning the ICN2: the speaker heard the message that countries need to be more in the driver seat and confirmed it is necessary to listen to those "in the trenches": this has been missing in the ICN2 process so far. There is an ICN2 steering committee made up mainly of international organizations. We can work to identify some regional organizations or expertise that we can bring on to that steering committee. There is need to develop more concrete outcomes and ensuring that they will be actually delivered. The Director-Generals of both FAO and WHO are very solidly behind the ICN2. It will be formally announced at the CEB meeting the following week to the other UN partners.

Closing remarks

Dr Oleg Chestnov, Assistant Director-General, World Health Organization (WHO)

This meeting has served as a milestone process for a successful ICN2 conference. There is no other choice as for the ICN2 conference to be perfect. ADG's expectation is to identify the role of WHO and to reach mutual understanding with agriculture institutions to play a complementary role as well as to find a way to implement the agenda and be successful for the new sustainable development goals. Special appreciation goes to the eight countries' representatives which made excellent presentations and the interpreters.

Annex 1: List of acronyms

Ag2Nut	Agriculture to Nutrition
A4NH	Agriculture for Nutrition and Health
CAADP	Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme
CAP	Comprehensive Agriculture Policy
CFS	Committee on World Food Security and Nutrition
CGIAR	Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
COP	Conference Of the Parties
DFID	Department for International Development (United Kingdom)
ECOSOC	ECOnomic and SOCial Council
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FICA	Flemish International Cooperation Agency
FNS	Food and Nutrition Security
GINA	Global database on the Implementation of Nutrition Action
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
HIV/AIDS	Human Immunodeficiency Virus/ Acquired ImmunoDeficiency Syndrome
HLTF	High-Level Task Force
ICN	International Conference on Nutrition
ICN2	Second International Conference on Nutrition
IDS	Institute for Development Studies
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development

IFPRI	International Food Policy Research Institute
INFORMAS	International Network for Food and Obesity / Non-communicable Diseases Research, Monitoring and Action Support
IPSAS	International Public Sector Accounting Standards
IPSD	Intergovernmental Panel for Sustainable Diets
LANSA	Leveraging Agriculture for Nutrition in South Asia
LMIC	Low and Middle-Income Countries
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NCD	Noncommunicable Disease
NEPAD	New Partnership for Africa's Development
OECD	The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
REACH	Renewed Efforts Against Child Hunger
R&D	Research and Development
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals
SUN	Scaling Up Nutrition
SUNRAY	Sustainable Nutrition Research for Africa in the Years to come
UK	United Kingdom
UN	United Nations
UN DESA	United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme

UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNGA	United Nations General Assembly
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNSCN	UN System Standing Committee on Nutrition
UPF	Ultra-processed Foods
VC	Value Chain
WASH	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene
WFP	World Food Program
WHA	World Health Assembly
WHO	World Health Organization
WTO	World Trade Organization
ZHC	Zero Hunger Challenge

Annex 2: Participants list

1. **Tim Armstrong**
Coordinator
World Health Organization (WHO)
Email: armstrongt@who.int

2. **Francesco Branca**
Executive Secretary
United Nations Systems Standing Committee on Nutrition (UNSCN)
Email: brancaf@who.int

3. **Barbara Burlingame**
Senior Nutrition Advisor
Food and Agriculture Organization
Email: Barbara.burlingame@fao.org

4. **David Cheong**
Chief Technical Adviser
International Labour Organization (ILO)
Email: cheong@ilo.org

5. **Kimberly Chung**
Associate Professor
Michigan State University
Email: kchung@anr.msu.edu

6. **Bruce Cogill**
Programme Leader, Nutrition & Marketing of Diversity
Bioversity International
Email: b.cogill@cgiar.org

7. **Sarah Curran**
Program Manager
Centre on Globalization and Sustainable Development (CGSD)
The Earth Institute, Columbia University
Email: scurran@ei.columbia.edu

8. **Alan Dangour**
Senior Lecturer
London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine (LSHTM)
Email: alan.dangour@lshtm.ac.uk

9. **Sabrina De Oliveira Granheim**
Independent Consultant
Email: Sabrina.ionata@gmail.com

10. **Mame Ndiobo Diene**
Technical Advisor
Ministry of Agriculture, Senegal
Email: ndiobodiene@yahoo.fr

11. **Carlos Dora**
Coordinator
World Health Organization (WHO)
Email: dorac@who.int

12. **Charlotte Dufour**
Technical Officer
Food and Agriculture Organization
Email : Charlotte.dufour@fao.org

13. **Etienne Du Vachat**
Food Security Advocacy Officer
Action Contre la Faim – ACF (Action Against Hunger)
Email : eduvachat@actioncontrelafaim.org

14. **Jessica Fanzo**
Assistant Professor
Columbia University Medical Center
Email : jfanzo@gmail.com

15. **Patrizia Fracassi**
Technical Officer
Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN)
Email : patrizia.fracassi@undp.org

16. **Linda Fulponi**
Senior Economist
Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)
Email : Linda.FULPONI@oecd.org

17. **Amandine Garde**
Professor of Law
University of Liverpool
Email: amandine.garde@liverpool.ac.uk

18. **Greg Garrett**
Director
Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition (GAIN)
Email: ggarrett@gainhealth.org

19. **James Garrett**
Sr. Research Fellow, IFPRI
Email : jamgarr@gmail.com

20. **Stuart Gillespie**
Senior Research Fellow
International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI)
Email : s.gillespie@cgiar.org

21. **Bibi Giyose**
Advisor, Food and Nutrition Security
The New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD)
Email : bibig@nepad.org

22. **Eva Hain**
Project Officer
Federal Office for Agriculture and Food (BLE), Germany
Email : Eva.Hain@ble.de

23. **Corinna Hawkes**
Head of Policy and Public Affairs
World Cancer Research Fund
Email : c.hawkes@wcrf.org

24. **Mariana Helcias Cortes**
Policy Advisor
Secretariat of FNS, Ministry of Social Development and Fight Against Hunger in Brazil
Email : mariana.helcias@mds.gov.br

25. **Anna Herforth**
Independent Consultant
Email: Anna.Herforth@gmail.com

26. **Diane Holland**
Senior Nutrition Consultant
World Food Programme (WFP)
Email: diane.holland@wfp.org

27. **Abdoulaye Ka**
National Coordinator
Cellule de Lutte contre la Malnutrition, Senegal
Email: aka@clm.sn

28. **Sean Kennedy**
Technical Officer
International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)
Email: s.kennedy@ifad.org

29. **Patrick Kolsteren**
Coordinator, Nutrition & Child Health Unit
Institute of Tropical Medicine Antwerp, Belgium
Email: PKolsteren@itg.be

30. **Aminata Koroma**
National Nutrition Program Manager
Ministry of Health, Sierra Leone
Email: shamitamin@gmail.com

31. **Michael Krawinkel**
Professor of Human Nutrition
University of Giessen, Germany
Email: Michael.Krawinkel@ernaehrung.uni-giessen.de

32. **Kathleen Kurz**
Principal Development Specialist Nutrition
DAI
Email: Kathleen_Kurz@dai.com

33. Professor Shiriki Kumananyika
Epidemiology
University of Pennsylvania
Email: skumanyi@mail.med.upenn.edu

34. **Carl Lachat**
Professor' and 'Researcher
Department of Food Safety & Food Quality, University of Gent, Belgium
Email: Carl.Lachat@ugent.be

35. **Professor Tim Lang**
Food Policy
City University, London
Email: t.lang@city.ac.uk

36. **James Levinson**
Independent Consultant
Ag2Nut Community
Email: james.levinson@gmail.com

37. **Timothy Lobstein**
Director of Policy
International Obesity Task Force
Email: tlobstein@iaso.org

38. **Bettina Luedtke**
Project Officer
Federal Office for Agriculture and Food (BLE), Germany
Email: Bettina.Luedtke@ble.de

39. **Yves Martin-Prevel**
Epidemiologist
Institut de Développement et de Recherche (IRD)
Email: yves.martin-prevel@ird.fr

40. **Lina Mahy**
Technical Officer
United Nations Systems Standing Committee on Nutrition (UNSCN)
Email: mahyl@who.int

41. **Anne-Marie Mayer**
Food Nutrition Advisor
Concern Worldwide
Email: AnneMarie.Mayer@concern.net

42. **Mildred McLachlan**
Director of Research & Information

Division of Human Nutrition, University of Stellenbosch, South Africa
Email: millam@sun.ac.za

43. **Divya Mehra**
Policy Officer
World Food Programme (WFP)
Email: divya.mehra@wfp.org

44. **Agnes Mgomezulu**
Technical Officer

Ministry of Agriculture, Extension Services, Nutrition unit, Malawi
Email: mzondwa22@hotmail.com

45. **Edith Mkawa**
Permanent Secretary
Secretariat for Nutrition & HIV/AIDS, Malawi
Email: edithmkawa@yahoo.com

46. **Carlos Monteiro**
Professor

University of Sao Paulo, Brazil
Email: carlosam@usp.br

47. **Julien Morel**
Nutrition Security Advisor

Action Contre le Faim
Email: jmorel@actioncontrelafaim.org

48. **Noreen Mucha**
Consultant
Email: noreenm@gwmail.gwu.edu

49. **David Nabarro**
United Nations Secretary-General Special Representative for Food Security & Nutrition, Scaling Up Nutrition Coordinator

United Nations High Level Task Force, SUN
Email: David.nabarro@undp.org

50. **Leo Nederveen**
Technical Officer

World Health Organization (WHO)
Email: nederveenl@who.int

51. **Chizuru Nishida**
Coordinator

World Health Organization (WHO)
Email: nishidac@who.int

52. **Joyce Njoro**
REACH Technical Officer

World Food Programme
Email: joyce.njoro@wfp.org

53. **Rachel Nugent**
Professor
Disease Control Priorities Network, Department of Global Health, University of Washington, USA
Email: rnugent2@uw.edu

54. **David Pelletier**
Professor

Cornell University, USA
Email: dlp5@cornell.edu

55. **Cedric Pene**
Technical Officer

Secretariat Agriculture and Commodities Division, World Trade Organization (WTO

Email: Cedric.pene@wto.org

56. **Raj Kumar Pokharel**
Chief Nutritionist
MOH Nutrition Section, Child Health Division, Department of Health Services, Nepal
Email: rajkumarpokharel@gmail.com

57. **Birgit Poniatowski**
Partnership Forum Manager and Interim Manager, Board Relations

Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition (GAIN)

Email: bponiatowski@gainhealth.org

58. **Alex Rees**
Head of Hunger Reduction & Livelihoods
Save The Children UK
Email: A.Rees@savethechildren.org.uk

59. **Franco Sassi**
Senior Health Economist
Health Division, Directorate for Employment, Labour and Social Affairs, Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)
Email: Franco.SASSI@oecd.org

60. **Josef Schmidhuber**
Deputy Director
Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)
Email: Josef.schmidhuber@fao.org

61. **Hettie Schonfeldt**
Professor
University of Pretoria, South Africa
Email: hettie.schonfeldt@up.ac.za

62. **Mohamed Sheriff**
Deputy Director
Planning Evaluation Monitoring and Statistics Division, Ministry of Agriculture Forestry and Food Security, Sierra Leone
Email: medajuba@yahoo.com

63. **Boyd Swinburn**
Professor
Population Nutrition and Global Health in the School of Population Health, University of Auckland, New Zealand
Email: boyd.swinburn@auckland.ac.nz

64. **Yurie Tanimichi Hoberg**
Senior Economist
World Bank
Email: ytanimichi@worldbank.org

65. **Dudley Tarlton**
Programme Specialist HIV, Health & Development Group
United Nations Development Fund (UNDP)
Email: Dudley.tarlton@undp.org

66. **Almeida Tembe**
Technical Officer
SETSAN, Mozambique
Email: tembealmeida@gmail.com

67. **Paul Thomassin**
Associate professor in Agriculture Economics program
McGill University, Canada
Email: Paul.thomassin@mcgill.ca

68. **Brian Thompson**
Technical Officer
Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)
Email: Brian.Thompson@fao.org

69. **Ann Tutwiler**
Special Representative of the Director-General in Geneva
Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)
Email: Ann.Tutwiler@fao.org

70. **Marti Van Liere**
Director
Nutritious Foods for Children and Mothers, Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition (GAIN)
Email: mvanliere@gainhealth.org

71. Eugenio Villar
Coordinator
World Health Organization (WHO)
Email:villare@who.int

72. **Margaret Wagah**
Consultant
Development Concern International
Email: wagamargaret@gmail.com

73. **Emorn Wasantwisut**
Professor
University of Mahidol, Thailand
Email: emorn.was@mahidol.ac.th

74. **Amy Webb Girard**
Assistant Professor
Emory University, USA
Email: awebb3@emory.edu

75. **Simone Welte**
Project Officer
Federal Office for Agriculture and Food (BLE), Germany
Email: Simone.Welte@ble.de

76. **Christiane Wolff**
Counsellor
Agriculture and Commodities Division, World Trade Organization (WTO)
Email: Christiane.wolff@wto.org

77. **Marzella Wüstefeld**
Technical Officer
United Nations Systems Standing Committee on Nutrition (UNSCN)
Email: wustefeldm@who.int

Annex 3: Guiding principles for Nutrition-sensitive Agriculture

Key recommendations for Improving Nutrition through Agriculture

Food systems provide for all people's nutritional needs, while at the same time contributing to economic growth. The food and agriculture sector has the primary role in feeding people well by **increasing availability, affordability, and consumption of diverse, safe, nutritious foods and diets,** aligned with dietary recommendations and environmental sustainability. Applying these principles helps strengthen resilience and contributes to sustainable development.

Agricultural programmes and investments can strengthen impact on nutrition if they:

1. **Incorporate explicit nutrition objectives and indicators into their design, and track and mitigate potential harms,** while seeking synergies with economic, social and environmental objectives.
2. **Assess the context at the local level, to design appropriate activities to address the types and causes of malnutrition,** including chronic or acute undernutrition, vitamin and mineral deficiencies, and obesity and chronic disease. Context assessment can include potential food resources, agro-ecology, seasonality of production and income, access to productive resources such as land, market opportunities and infrastructure, gender dynamics and roles, opportunities for collaboration with other sectors or programmes, and local priorities.
3. **Target the vulnerable and improve equity** through participation, access to resources, and decent employment. Vulnerable groups include smallholders, women, youth, the landless, urban dwellers, the unemployed.
4. **Collaborate and coordinate with other sectors** (health, environment, social protection, labor, water and sanitation, education, energy) and programmes, through joint strategies with common goals, to address concurrently the multiple underlying causes of malnutrition.
5. **Maintain or improve the natural resource base** (water, soil, air, climate, biodiversity), critical to the livelihoods and resilience of vulnerable farmers and to sustainable food and nutrition security for all. Manage water resources in particular to reduce vector-borne illness and to ensure sustainable, safe household water sources.
6. **Empower women** by ensuring access to productive resources, income opportunities, extension services and information, credit, labor and time-saving technologies (including energy and water services), and supporting their voice in household and farming decisions. Equitable opportunities to earn and learn should be compatible with safe pregnancy and young child feeding.
7. **Facilitate production diversification, and increase production of nutrient-dense crops and small-scale livestock** (for example, horticultural products, legumes, livestock and fish at a small scale, underutilized crops, and biofortified crops). Diversified production systems are important to vulnerable producers to enable resilience to climate and price shocks, more diverse food consumption, reduction of seasonal food and income fluctuations, and greater and more gender-equitable income generation.
8. **Improve processing, storage and preservation** to retain nutritional value, shelf-life, and food safety, to reduce seasonality of food insecurity and post-harvest losses, and to make healthy foods convenient to prepare.
9. **Expand markets and market access for vulnerable groups, particularly for marketing nutritious foods** or products vulnerable groups have a comparative advantage in producing. This can include innovative promotion (such as marketing based on nutrient content), value addition, access to price information, and farmer associations.
10. **Incorporate nutrition promotion and education** around food and sustainable food systems that builds on existing local knowledge, attitudes and practices. Nutrition knowledge can enhance the impact of production and income in rural households, especially important for women and young children, and can increase demand for nutritious foods in the general population.

These recommendations have been formulated following an extensive review of available guidance on agriculture programming for nutrition, conducted by FAO (see: http://www.fao.org/docrep/017/aq194e/aq194e00.htm), and through consultation with a broad range of partners (CSOs, NGOs, government staff, donors, UN agencies) in particular through the Ag2Nut Community of Practice. They are also referred to as "guiding principles" by some partners.

Key recommendations for Improving Nutrition through Agriculture

Agriculture programmes and investments need to be supported by an enabling policy environment if they are to contribute to improving nutrition. Governments can encourage improvements in nutrition through agriculture by taking into consideration the 5 policy actions below.

Food and agriculture policies can have a better impact on nutrition if they:

1. **Increase incentives (and decrease disincentives) for availability, access, and consumption of diverse, nutritious and safe foods through environmentally sustainable production, trade, and distribution.** The focus needs to be on horticulture, legumes, and small-scale livestock and fish – foods which are relatively unavailable and expensive, but nutrient-rich – and vastly underutilized as sources of both food and income.

2. **Monitor dietary consumption and access to safe, diverse, and nutritious foods.** The data could include food prices of diverse foods, and dietary consumption indicators for vulnerable groups.

3. **Include measures that protect and empower the poor and women.** Safety nets that allow people to access nutritious food during shocks or seasonal times when income is low; land tenure rights; equitable access to productive resources; market access for vulnerable producers (including information and infrastructure). Recognizing that a majority of the poor are women, ensure equitable access to all of the above for women.

4. **Develop capacity** in human resources and institutions to improve nutrition through the food and agriculture sector, supported with adequate financing.

5. **Support multi-sectoral strategies to improve nutrition** within national, regional, and local government structures.

The present key recommendations for Improving Nutrition through Agriculture target policy makers and programme planners. These recommendations are based on the current global context, and may be updated over time as challenges and opportunities to improve nutrition through agriculture shift.

Annex 4:Declaration of Interest

All participants were requested to complete the WHO Declaration of Interest form.

Professor Rachel Nugent declared having received a grant from the Chicago Council on Global Affairs (2011) which was provided by PepsiCo for research on NCDs and food and agriculture.

Professor Milla McLachlan received consultancy fees from PepsiCo for work on undernutrition and public-private partnerships (2011). Professor McLachlan further collaborated to provide support to prepare a South-South University graduate program on agriculture, food security and nutrition funded by PepsiCo and related travel costs for self were covered by PepsiCo (2011).

Professor Emorn Wasantwisut declared being a technical scientific advisor to ILSI-South East Asia as well as a GAIN Partnership Council Member. Professor Wasantwisut received an honorarium from Danone (2012-2013) for being Member of the Danone International Prize for Nutrition Committee (2012-2013). She further declared receiving an honorarium from the Culinary Institute of America (2012-2014) as member of the Scientific and Public Health Advisory Committee.

The following participants declared having been consulting for UN Organizations, International NGOs or other not-for-profit entities on nutrition-related issues: Professor Jessica Fanzo, Dr Anne-Marie Mayer, Dr James Garrett, Dr Corinna Hawkes.

Greg Garrett mentioned being employed by GAIN.

The declared interests were not considered to constitute any conflict of interest for their role as facilitator or participant of the Meeting of the Minds.

Comments from participants:

"This was about having country voices as a part of the discussion from the beginning and being partners -- not just having them there to convince or co-opt those about the work 'we' want to do."

"Well done on an interesting meeting."

"I felt the meeting was extremely productive, friendly, and fun."

"I believe you are right how unusual it was, and I am optimistic about the potential of the track you are pursuing to really achieve (over time) a new mindset about how to achieve heath through agriculture, food systems and nutrition."

"I appreciated the breath of the issues presented, and learned a lot."

"It was a great meeting and my pleasure, and honor, to take part of it."

"I really appreciated the bringing together of professionals working more on the NCD agenda in 'developed' countries and those from the 'development' world."

"Still smiling about the meeting we had."

"Many thanks for the excellent meeting."

Meeting of the Minds on the Nutrition Impact of Food Systems

Preparing for the International Conference on Nutrition (ICN2)

This report provides a summary of the presentations, discussions and key issues of a four-day meeting, funded by the Flemish International Cooperation Agency (FICA). The meeting was hosted by the World Health Organization (WHO) and took place in Geneva from 25 – 28 March 2013. More than 70 experts discussed the actual and potential nutrition impact of relevant policies shaping the food system at global and country level and provided recommendations and new ideas for the International Conference on Nutrition (ICN2) which will take place in Rome (November 2013 and 2014). All presentations can be downloaded from the UNSCN website (www.unscn.org).

UNSCN Secretariat - c/o WHO - 20, Avenue Appia – CH 1211 Geneva 27 – Switzerland – www.unscn.org