**WFP comments on CFS HLPE Livestock report V0 draft**

While FSN is mentioned repeatedly as one of the key focus areas for how the contribution of the production and consumption of livestock is assessed, the attention to nutrition remains very superficial and there are a couple of basic errors in the report as well. More information could be included about how food systems could be linked to nutrition and thereby improving nutrition. The report would also benefit from making more linkages with the contribution to SDG2s, as discussed in the introduction.

**A. Errors:**

1. Statistics.
   1. P8 – lines 4-11, states the following: 800 million hungry, 2.5 billion affected by malnutrition and 2.1 billion overweight including 671 million obese. What is meant with ‘malnutrition’, should this be 2 billion with micronutrient deficiencies?
   2. P11 – lines 16-18, similar statistics, but now it says 795 with chronic undernourishment (instead of ‘hungry’), two billion suffering from nutrient deficiencies, which should be MICROnutrient deficiencies, and two billion overweight or obese.
   3. Furthermore, undernutrition in early life, or stunting, affects 26% of under-fives. Considering that this affects individuals for life, and prevalence was higher among the generation that are adults today, more than 2 billion people live with the consequences of stunting during their early childhood. ASF play an important role in the prevention of stunting (see below), which should be mentioned early on in the report.
2. Definitions & terms
   1. P11 – line 20, states that undernourishment is the result of chronic calorie deficiency, while undernourishment is in fact defined as not having enough calories’. By stating that it is the result of chronic calorie deficiency, it is equated to a clinical sign, which is not how this term is defined and the number affected is estimated. Malnutrition is observed at the individual level using biochemical and anthropometric indicators, not undernourishment. And more importantly, malnutrition can be due to many dietary deficiencies (kcal, micronutrients etc) as well as illness (i.e. direct causes in UNICEF conceptual framework).
   2. P8 – lines 31-37, mentions ‘sources of vitamins and key micronutrients’ – vitamins and minerals are ‘micronutrients’, so if something is a source of key micronutrients, that already includes vitamins (as well as minerals)
3. Nutrients contained in ASF
   1. P8 – lines 31-37 states that several micronutrients are contained in ASF that are not found in plant foods. However, only vitamin B12 is not found in plant foods. What should be said instead is that although most micronutrients are also found in plant foods, their content, but particularly their bioavailability, is better from ASF. Good examples are iron, zinc, vitamin A. This makes ASF an important source of (micro) nutrients, especially for groups with high needs (young children, pregnant and lactating women, people suffering from undernutrition).
   2. The emphasis for the role of ASF should be on how they are an essential part of the diet to ensure that nutrient requirements are being met, especially among those that are nutritionally most at-risk. This is a different focus compared to what is stated in P8 – lines 31-37: ‘valuable in combating malnutrition’, which gives the impression that once malnutrition is diagnosed, animal foods should be prescribed.

Similar comments apply to P17, lines 38-48.

**B. Need for more in-depth discussion on role of different ASF in the diet, whose diet, and in what amounts**

The role of ASF as source of essential nutrients during particular periods of the lifecycle needs to be mentioned. On p17, from line 49 onwards, there is discussion on the importance and also on the risks of animal source foods, without becoming more nuanced about why ASF are important and for whom and in what amounts, as well as which types are better (fish, poultry, eggs, dairy) and which should be consumed in moderation (red meat, processed meat).

For young children, dairy is important for linear growth (stunting prevention), which is important to mention specifically.

With regard to amounts that can be consumed, there is a very good discussion on balancing energy, climate change and health in McMichael, Powles, Butler & Uauy, Lancet 2007;370:1253-63, and it will be very good to compare their recommended per capita intake to the intakes reported on p27, lines 22-29 and p24, lines 8-24 of the CFS report V0.

**C. Other Specific Comments**

* Particular parts of the report are more (or only) focused on livestock, e.g. chapter 2.7 and 3.1.2. Conclusions of chapter 2 could include more information on sustainable agricultural development. With respect to 3.1.2., it is not clear why interlinkages between gender and agricultural development have not been made – is the intended focus jus ton on livestock in this part of the report?
* Page 32-33: In total, six different types of systems are distinguished in the report, i.e. pastoralist and agro-pastoralist systems, smallholder mixed farming systems, intensive livestock systems, commercial ranchers, intensive crop farming and smallholder systems where animals represent less than 10 percent of the total farm output in value terms. It is not clear why Table 1 on page 59-60 only includes the first four livestock systems.
* Page 17, lines 49-50: How about the WHO guideline on limited red/processed meat intake? (<http://www.iarc.fr/en/media-centre/pr/2015/pdfs/pr240_E.pdf>)
* Page 23-24: it is not clear why FAO projections are presented in a separate chapter. Would suggest combining 2.1.1 and 2.1.2, also because ‘projections’ are again discussed in 2.1.2, lines 39-41 and lines 46-48.
* Page 60, lines 6-9: It now seems that livestock is not nutritious, however the high nutritional value of meat (protein, micronutrients) has been discussed before and is not taken into account here. Suggestion to include more precision on broad claims.