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Collection of contributions received

The online consultation “Strengthening urban and peri-urban food systems to achieve food security and nutrition in the context of urbanization and rural transformation – V0 draft of the HLPE-FSN report #19” was held on the FAO Global Forum on Food Security and Nutrition platform from 6 December 2023 to 26 January 2024. The consultation was available in English, French and Spanish.

The consultation was organized in the context of the further development of the V0 draft report of the High Level Panel of Experts on Food Security and Nutrition (HLPE-FSN) of the Committee on World Food Security (CFS), which then be submitted to peer review, before finalization and approval by the HLPE-FSN drafting team and the Steering Committee. The final report will be presented at CFS 52nd plenary session in October 2024 and provide recommendations to the CFS workstream.

Évariste Nicolétis and Paola Termine, from the HLPE-FSN Secretariat, facilitated this consultation that received 75 insightful and sharp contributions from 33 countries, diverse public and private organizations working in different fields of expertise, academia, civil society, and other institutions. Participants represented: Argentina, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Congo, Ethiopia, France, Germany, Hungary, India, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Switzerland, UK, and USA.

This document is the Proceedings report on the consultation that includes the topic note and the content of all contributions in a chronological way.
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Topic note

During its 50th Plenary Session (10 – 13 October 2022), the Committee on World Food Security (CFS) requested the High Level Panel of Experts on Food Security and Nutrition (HLPE-FSN) to produce a report entitled "Strengthening urban and peri-urban food systems to achieve food security and nutrition in the context of urbanization and rural transformation" which will be the 19th report of the HLPE-FSN. The overall aim of the report is to explore the issues surrounding urbanization, rural transformation and their implications for food security and nutrition (FSN). The report was also tasked to develop action-oriented policy recommendations on urban and peri-urban food systems that will encourage coordinated policies for FSN across rural, urban and peri-urban areas, taking into account the specific needs of diverse rural and urban contexts and the linkages between them.

The report will be presented at CFS 52nd plenary session in October 2024 and provide recommendations to the CFS workstream "Strengthening urban and peri-urban food systems to achieve food security and nutrition in the context of urbanization and rural transformation".

As the CFS Multi-Year Programme of Work (MYPOW) 2024-2027 indicates, “growing urbanization, combined with the reorientation of urban and peri-urban agricultural lands to more profitable uses, have been gradually leading to a "geographical decoupling" of urban areas from sources of food supply, posing higher risks for food security and nutrition. In the absence of specific food systems planning across the rural-urban continuum, the sale and consumption of highly processed foods is growing in most urban centers, while local commerce that delivers healthy, fresh food at affordable prices is neglected, with negative impacts on food security and nutrition.”

Over 50 percent of the world's population already live in urban areas, and that proportion is set to increase to over 70 percent by 2050. Approximately 1.1 billion people currently live in urban informal settlements, with two billion more expected in the next 30 years. Correspondingly, food insecurity and malnutrition in all its forms is increasingly an urban challenge, with 50 percent of urban populations in the least-developed countries being food-insecure, compared with 43 percent in rural areas.

It is imperative to address the challenges of urbanization in relation to rural transformation to “build back better” in the wake of COVID-19 pandemic, the impact of climate change and conflicts. The current multi-layered global food crisis points to the importance and potential of the territorial dimension of food systems – addressing poverty and inequality, building resilience and social inclusion and fostering sustainable livelihoods.

To respond to this CFS request and as part of the report development process, the HLPE-FSN is launching this e-consultation to seek inputs, suggestions and comments on the V0 draft of the report.

HLPE-FSN V0 drafts of reports are deliberately presented early enough in the process – as work in progress, with their range of imperfections – to allow sufficient time to properly consider the feedback received in the elaboration of the report. E-consultations are a key part of the inclusive and knowledge-based dialogue between the HLPE-FSN Steering Committee and the scientific and knowledge community at large.
## QUESTIONS TO GUIDE THE E-CONSULTATION ON THE V0 DRAFT OF THE REPORT

This V0 draft identifies areas for recommendations and contributions on which the HLPE-FSN of the CFS welcomes suggestions or proposals, in particular addressing the following questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. | **The V0 draft introduces a conceptual framework informed by key principles established in previous HLPE-FSN reports (HLPE, 2017; HLPE, 2020).**  
Do you find the proposed framework effective to highlight and discuss the key issues concerning urban and peri-urban food systems?  
Is this a useful conceptual framework to provide practical guidance for policymakers?  
Can you offer suggestions for examples to illustrate and facilitate the operationalization of the conceptual framework to address issues relevant for FSN? |
| 2. | **The report adopts the broader definition of food security (proposed by the HLPE-FSN in 2020), which includes six dimensions of food security: availability, access, utilization, stability, agency and sustainability.**  
Does the V0 draft cover sufficiently the implications of this broader definition in urban and peri-urban food systems? |
| 3. | Are the trends/variables/elements identified in the draft report the key ones to strengthen urban and peri-urban food systems? If not, **which other elements should be considered?**  
Are there any other issues concerning urban and peri-urban food systems that have not been sufficiently covered in the draft report?  
Are topics under- or over-represented in relation to their importance? |
| 4. | Is there additional quantitative or qualitative data that should be included?  
Are there other references, publications, or traditional or different kind of knowledges, which should be considered? |
| 5. | Are there any redundant facts or statements that could be eliminated from the V0 draft? |
| 6. | Could you suggest case studies and success stories from countries that were able to strengthen urban and peri-urban food systems? In particular, the HLPE-FSN would seek contributions on:  
   a) evidence-based examples of successful interventions in urban and peri-urban food systems with the principles behind what made the process work;  
   b) efforts made to enhance agency in urban and peri-urban food systems;  
   c) efforts made to enhance the right to food in urban and peri-urban settings; |
d) examples of circular economy and urban and peri-urban food system and climate change adaptation and mitigation, preferably beyond issues of production; and
e) examples of national and local government collaboration on urban and peri-urban food systems.

The results of this consultation will be used by the HLPE-FSN to further elaborate the report, which will then be submitted to peer review, before finalization and approval by the HLPE-FSN drafting team and the Steering Committee (more details on the different steps of the process, are available here).

This consultation is open until 26 January 2024.

We thank in advance all the contributors for reading, commenting and providing inputs on this V0 draft of the report. Comments can be submitted in English, French and Spanish.

The HLPE-FSN looks forward to a rich and fruitful consultation!

Co-facilitators:
Évariste Nicolétis, HLPE-FSN Coordinator
Paola Termine, HLPE-FSN Programme Officer
Contributions received

33. Paola Termine, CFS/HLPE-FSN, Italy

Dear contributors,

We take this opportunity to sincerely thank all those who have contributed to the consultation on the scope of the upcoming CFS HLPE-FSN report “Strengthening urban and peri-urban food systems to achieve food security and nutrition in the context of urbanization and rural transformation”.

We received 74 very insightful contributions from 33 countries, diverse public and private organizations working in different fields of expertise, academia, civil society and other institutions. These inputs will allow the HLPE-FSN to address the critical issues facing both policymakers and practitioners to ensure that urban and peri-urban food systems contribute to food security and nutrition.

Given the social and economic significance of food systems in urban and peri-urban areas, addressing the challenges and enhancing the positive impacts of urbanization and rural transformation is fundamental to achieve the realization of the right to food.

We truly appreciate the time and effort you devoted to provide your comments to this e-consultation. Your participation and your contributions are fundamental to ensuring legitimacy, scientific quality, and the incorporation of diverse forms of knowledge and expertise in the HLPE-FSN report “Strengthening urban and peri-urban food systems to achieve food security and nutrition in the context of urbanization and rural transformation”. Following this e-consultation, the drafting team led by Prof. Jane Battersby-Lennard will develop a revised draft of the report (V1) which will be submitted for peer review. Following peer review, the HLPE-FSN will launch the report on 2nd July 2024. The report will be presented at the 52nd plenary session of the CFS in October 2024, which will mark the start of the policy convergence process on this theme.

Paola Termine, HLPE-FSN Programme Officer, co-facilitator of this e-consultation

34. Lara Lobo Monteiro, Alternate Permanent Representative, Permanent Representative of Brazil to FAO, WFP and IFAD

Dear Evariste, Dear Paola, Dear HLPE Team,

Thank you very much for your flexibility in accepting Brazil's inputs to the zero draft of the HLPE Report on Urban and Peri-urban Food Systems. It is deeply appreciated.

As you can see in the attached document, we have received inputs from different areas of our Government working with policy and programs related to urban and peri-urban food systems and also to food security and nutrition in these areas.

Global Forum on Food Security and Nutrition www.fao.org/fsnforum
We sincerely hope that the comments and suggestions and experiences shared could be well taken into consideration by the drafting team. Please do not hesitate to contact me in case any questions arise.

Thank you once again.

Best regards,

Lara Lobo Monteiro

Alternate Permanent Representative of Brazil to FAO, WFP and IFAD

Brazil has received with great enthusiasm the initial draft of the report produced by the High-Level Panel of Experts on Food Security and Nutrition (HLPE- FSN) on "Strengthening Urban and Periurban Food Systems to Achieve Food Security and Nutrition in the Context of Urbanization and Rural Transformation." The document emphasizes the importance of understanding and addressing the complex challenges associated with changes in lifestyle patterns and dynamics of Food Systems, considering the urban and periurban context and its implications for shaping food systems and food and nutrition insecurity in all its forms.

2.2. The messages conveyed in the document provide valuable insights, in-depth analyses, and proposals for recommendations of significant relevance to guide food security and nutrition (FSN) policies in cities and for the development of effective strategies that can contribute to addressing the challenges of the urban and periurban food agenda. In this regard, we congratulate all those involved in the initiative for the notable commitment and dedicated effort in addressing this pressing and complex issue. Collaboration among CFS members, HLPE-FSN, and other stakeholders is crucial to creating sustainable and effective solutions that promote FSN in rural, urban, and periurban areas. This agenda is a priority for Brazil and is essential for building a more resilient and inclusive future, and the demonstrated commitment deserves recognition and continuous support.

2.3. Considering the importance of the urban and periurban food agenda and its active contribution to shaping food systems, as well as its implications for food security and nutrition and the projected growth of the urban population, Brazil has undertaken, in the Federal Government's Multi-Year Plan (PPA 2024-2027), the Strategic Planning of the Ministry of Development and Social Assistance, Family, and Fight Against Hunger (MDS), and the Brazil Without Hunger Plan, the commitment to propose and coordinate the National Strategy for Food Security and Nutrition in Cities. This commitment is made in the context of rebuilding the National Food and Nutrition Security System, with addressing food insecurity as a priority. The commitment to proposing and coordinating the National Strategy for Food Security and Nutrition in cities considers the following context:

In Brazil, the majority of the population (84.72%) lives in urban areas (IBGE, 2016). According to the 2022 Demographic Census, over half of the population (57.0%) resides in only 319 municipalities out of the 5,565 municipalities/cities in the country, highlighting concentration in municipalities with over 100,000 inhabitants. There are 46,484,567 people living in Brazilian capitals (IBGE, 2023).
By the end of 2022, of the 33 million Brazilians experiencing severe food insecurity, approximately 27.4 million live in cities, i.e., urban areas, according to the administrative division used in the country. Hunger is more prevalent in the North (25.7%) and Northeast (21%) regions of Brazil, affecting more families with women as heads and/or those where the reference person is black or brown, as well as households with children (PENSSAN Network, 2022).

The 2022 Demographic Census also indicates that the Brazilian population consists of 203,062,512 people (IBGE, 2023), with nearly half (47%) registered in the Single Registry for Federal Government Social Programs (CADUNICO). It is noteworthy that, within the country's social protection policies, CADUNICO is the tool used to identify low-income families for inclusion in social assistance and income redistribution programs. According to II VIGISSAN (PENSSAN Network, 2022), 43% of families with a per capita income of up to 1/4 of the minimum wage experience situations of hunger, underscoring the importance of CADUNICO in identifying populations vulnerable to social risk and insecurity.

October 2023 data from the CADUNICO Observatory, launched by the Ministry of Development and Social Assistance, Family, and Fight Against Hunger in 2023, indicate that 80.5% of households registered in CADUNICO are urban. Urban food environments do not favor adequate and healthy nutrition, posing significant barriers to achieving Food and Nutritional Security, especially in peripheral territories. Studies in Brazil reveal the presence of obesogenic environments, with high availability of unhealthy foods at more affordable prices, the influence of processed food advertising, and inequalities in access to adequate and healthy foods (Paiva, 2023; Araujo et al., 2022; Paula et al., 2021; Fortes et al., 2018; Duran, 2013).

Climate change is a global phenomenon primarily caused by human activity, including fossil fuel combustion, deforestation, the food system, and waste decomposition, contributing to food insecurity. Urban areas are most affected by disasters that impact the food and nutritional security of residents.

In 2023 alone, natural disasters caused a loss of 555 million dollars in Brazil. According to the National Confederation of Municipalities, 5.8 million Brazilians were affected by rains and droughts in 2023. One of the most perverse consequences of climate change and its intersection with food and nutritional insecurity is the deepening of race and gender inequalities as a result of structural racism permeating Brazilian society. Those who contribute the least to greenhouse gas emissions are the most affected by natural disasters. This is because the most affected individuals are Black, Quilombola, Indigenous people, and other traditional communities.

Given the aforementioned scenario, Brazil has launched the National Strategy for Food and Nutritional Security in Cities through Presidential Decree No. 11,822, dated December 12, 2023. The Strategy was developed within the scope of the Interministerial Chamber of Food and Nutritional Security (CAISAN), which brings together 24 federal government ministries. It involved the participation of experts, representatives from municipal and state governments, and other social actors engaged in the urban and periurban food agenda. The objective is to expand the production, access, availability, and consumption of adequate and healthy foods, prioritizing urban peripheral territories and populations in situations of vulnerability and social risk. It will be implemented considering the following axes:
I - Supply and availability of healthy foods in public and social food and nutritional security facilities;

II - Supply and availability of healthy foods in public and private supply facilities;

III - Promotion of urban food environments that favor adequate and healthy nutrition;

IV - Production of healthy and sustainable foods in cities and their surroundings;

V - Reduction of food losses and waste;

VI - Food and nutritional education, communication, and information on adequate and healthy nutrition;

VII - Intersectoral articulation between areas of social assistance, food and nutritional security, and health, among others, to provide actions and services for families and individuals in situations of food and nutritional insecurity at the local level; and

VIII - Support for the Urban Healthy Food Network, to be established by the Minister of State for Development and Social Assistance, Family, and Fight against Hunger, as a mechanism for mobilization, intersectoral and intergovernmental governance to promote horizontal cooperation among participating federative entities in the Strategy.

The implementation of the National Strategy for Food and Nutritional Security in Cities will seek to address the main challenges of the urban and periurban food agenda identified throughout the working process, namely:

I - Increase access, availability, and consumption of adequate, healthy, and safe foods in cities;

II - Reduce inequalities in populations in situations of vulnerability and social risk, considering the intersectionality of factors deepening social inequities;

III - Contribute to reducing food and nutritional insecurity and all forms of malnutrition;

IV - Strengthen:
   a) Healthy, sustainable, and circular food systems, including traditional agricultural systems; and
   b) Governance of actions related to urban and periurban food. V - Promote:
   a) Healthy and sustainable urban food environments;
   b) Local and regional food circuits, from production to consumption; and
c) Integrated and sustainable food supply systems.

VI - Favor the circularity of processes in different stages of production, distribution, consumption, and solid waste management, considering rural and urban integration; and

VII - Foster:

a) Articulation and innovation of actions, programs, and strategies at the local level that promote food sovereignty;

b) Initiatives of organized civil society in peripheral urban territories;

c) Development of healthy and sustainable cities;

d) Adaptation and mitigation of climate action;

e) Active and informed participation of organizations and communities in the conception, implementation, and monitoring of actions; and

f) Horizontal cooperation among cities that have joined the Strategy.

The Strategy will be implemented in priority cities through the Federal Government's induction and support for the coordinated implementation of actions and programs aimed at addressing local realities' challenges. This considers the situational diagnosis of the territory, prepared by local management with federal government support, and the possibilities offered by the "Menu of Ideas" that integrates the Strategy (urban gardens, solidarity kitchens, popular markets, food banks, institutional markets linked to family farming, among other actions). The definition of actions to be implemented in each axis will be preceded by a situational diagnosis of the territory to meet each city's needs. The Federal Government will provide cities joining the City Network (Urban Healthy Food Network - RUAS) with a toolbox to support the Strategy's implementation and management, containing instruments for local diagnosis, a platform for exchanging experiences, technical assistance, support from state governments, and funding for some actions, among others. RUAS will act as a mobilization mechanism, intersectoral and intergovernmental governance for promoting horizontal cooperation among participating federative entities in the Strategy.

In this context, we believe that the initial draft of the report produced by HLPE-FSN will greatly contribute to the implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of the National Strategy for Food and Nutritional Security in Cities in Brazil. It is timely for enhancing the actions proposed by the Brazilian initiative. We hope that our preliminary analysis of the draft, guided by insights from the development process of the National Strategy for Food and Nutritional Security in Cities, can also contribute to enriching the report, which is already powerful and valuable for discussions around the urban and periurban food agenda.

Below, we present the responses to the indicated guiding questions:
2.8. (i) The initial draft introduces a conceptual framework informed by key principles established in previous HLPE reports (HLPE, 2017; HLPE, 2020). Do you find the proposed framework effective in highlighting and discussing key issues related to urban and periurban food systems? Could this be a useful conceptual framework to provide practical guidance for policymakers? Could you offer suggestions for examples to illustrate and facilitate the operationalization of the conceptual framework to address issues relevant to Food and Nutritional Security (FNS)?

2.8.1. Based on HLPE, urban and periurban FNS is considered fulfilled if the conditions of availability, accessibility, utilization, stability, agency, and sustainability are met. The report highlights key principles related to FNS dimensions: productive and prosperous (availability), equitable (accessibility), healthy and nutritious (utilization), diversified and resilient (stability), empowerment (agency), and regenerative (sustainability).

2.8.2. The realization of FNS and strengthened food systems—and their interaction—is shaped by the interrelationships of spatial, social, economic, environmental, and political systems within the urban context and through the continuous process of urbanization, influencing system interactions from the local to the global scale.

2.8.3. The conceptual framework presented in the report acknowledges the complexity of interactions related to FNS and urban and periurban food systems and the challenges related to governance and political processes. It is useful in providing reflections and more contextualized perspectives for the formulation, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of public policies. However, it lacks concrete examples of possible approaches to address such challenges and complexities and practical guidance on how policymakers can use the conceptual framework in the decision-making process in local contexts.

2.8.4. Additionally, as a contribution, it might be interesting to more clearly express in the conceptual framework on page 11 issues discussed in chapters 5 and 6 of the report, such as mentioning the governance of public policies, especially the establishment of necessary instances and arenas for implementing intersectoral public policies demanded by the urban and periurban food agenda.

2.8.5. Throughout the report, the perspective of intersectionality and its implications for achieving FNS by different population groups is emphasized. However, this element is not sufficiently expressed in the conceptual framework, which, despite mentioning equity as a key principle related to the accessibility dimension, does not alert to determinants that condition and restrict the right to adequate food, regarding race/color, gender, vulnerability and social risk, and sexual orientation. It is suggested to include in the conceptual framework the circularity of the food system as a central concept related to the dimensions and key principles present in the report.

2.8.6. As examples to illustrate and facilitate the operationalization of the conceptual framework, it is suggested to mention case studies developed within the scope of LUPPA - Urban Laboratory of Food Policy, a project by the Institute of Tomorrow's Food @comidadoamanha, in co-production with @iclei_sams. Its goal is to support Brazilian cities in achieving healthy urban food systems for people and the planet, resilient to climate and economic vulnerabilities, and promoters of social justice.
2.9. (ii) The report adopts the broader definition of food security (proposed by HLPE in 2020), which includes six dimensions of food security: availability, access, utilization, stability, agency/action, and sustainability. Does the initial draft sufficiently cover the implications of this broader definition on urban and periurban food systems?

2.9.1. According to the report, Food and Nutritional Security is a situation that exists when all people, at all times, have physical, social, and economic access to sufficient, safe, and nutritious food that meets their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life (FAO, 2001). The achievement of FNS can only be attained if the conditions of all six developed dimensions of food security are met. These dimensions interact with food systems and urban systems to shape FNS outcomes.

2.9.2. We believe that the definition of FNS is sufficiently described. We suggest only adding to the FNS concept some elements present in the Brazilian concept in the Organic Law of Food and Nutritional Security - LOSAN (Law No. 11,346, of September 15, 2006), such as explicitly stating that FNS is the realization of a right for all; that access should be regular and permanent; that access to these foods should not compromise access to other essential needs; and that these foods should be environmentally, culturally, economically, and socially sustainable.

2.9.3. Specifically regarding the sustainability concept, we find it interesting to consider the definition proposed by Blay-Palmer et al (2020), which conceptualizes sustainable food systems at their interface with social, economic, and environmental dimensions. The authors emphasize that inclusive, transparent, participatory, and democratic governance mechanisms are essential to sustain these three dimensions of sustainable food systems. In the social dimension, the authors argue that sustainable food systems need to include the right to food and ensure food and nutritional security, food democracy, fair work practices, gender equity, social connectivity, cultural self-determination, and rights to natural resources (e.g., access to land). Concerning the economic dimension, sustainable food systems would be built on the premise of maintaining equitable economic activities, strengthening short circuits, alternative food networks, cooperatives, communities supporting agriculture, and other collaborative networks. Regarding the environmental dimension, sustainable food systems need to incorporate ecological production methods that recognize the importance of agroecology, innovative approaches, sustainable intensification, bioeconomy, biodiversity, and renewable resources; protect soil, water, and other resources' quality; and work toward regenerative closed-loop food systems.

2.9.4. Although the listed key principles are central to guiding urban and periurban food systems and have been established in previous HLPE reports, it might be useful to include more details on the conceptualization of each with concrete examples for the urban environment to ensure their interpretation aligns with the positions the report advocates. Furthermore, including examples of inspiring experiences of urban and periurban food systems that move towards realizing food and nutritional security as defined in the report seems interesting to guide policymakers and materialize this definition in a practical way.

2.10. (iii) Are the trends/variables/elements identified in the preliminary report the main ones to strengthen urban and periurban food systems? If not, what other elements should be considered? Are
there other issues related to urban and peri-urban food systems that were not sufficiently addressed in the preliminary report? Are the topics under or over-represented in terms of their importance?

2.10.1. The report emphasizes that to strengthen urban food systems, it is crucial to adopt multi-level, multi-stakeholder governance approaches, recognizing the complexity of these systems.

2.10.2. Urban contextual dimensions play a fundamental role in the feasibility of interventions, influencing the participation of local authorities, partners, and incentive structures. Understanding the powers of local governments, including the degree of decentralization, mandates, and capacities, is essential.

2.10.3. Mapping stakeholders in urban food systems, assessing which departments, ministries, and agencies are responsible for which part of the food systems, and whether they have sufficient budgets and human resources. Below, we present the answers to the indicated guiding questions:

2.8. (i) The initial draft introduces a conceptual framework informed by key principles established in previous reports from HLPE (HLPE, 2017; HLPE, 2020). Do you find the proposed framework effective in highlighting and discussing key issues related to urban and peri-urban food systems? Would this conceptual framework be useful in providing practical guidance for policymakers? Could you offer suggestions for examples to illustrate and facilitate the operationalization of the conceptual framework in addressing issues relevant to SAN?

2.8.1. Based on HLPE, urban and peri-urban FSN is considered achieved if the conditions of availability, accessibility, utilization, stability, agency, and sustainability are met. Relating to FSN dimensions, the report highlights key principles: productive and prosperous (availability), equitable (accessibility), healthy and nutritious (utilization), diversified and resilient (stability), empowerment (agency), and regenerative (sustainability).

2.8.2. The realization of FSN and strengthened food systems—and their interaction—is shaped by the interconnections of spatial, social, economic, environmental, and political systems within the urban context and through the ongoing process of urbanization, influencing interactions from the local to the global scale.

2.8.3. The conceptual framework presented in the report considers the complexity of interactions related to FSN and urban and peri-urban food systems and the challenges related to governance and political processes. In this sense, it is useful for providing reflections and more contextualized insights for the formulation, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of public policies. However, it lacks concrete examples of possible approaches to addressing such challenges and complexities and practical guidance on how managers can use the conceptual framework in the decision-making process in local contexts.

2.8.4. Furthermore, as a contribution, it could be interesting to clearly express in the conceptual framework on page 11 issues discussed in chapters 5 and 6 of the draft report, such as mentioning the
governance of public policies, especially the establishment of instances and arenas necessary for the implementation of intersectoral public policies as demanded by the urban and peri-urban food agenda.

2.8.5. Throughout the report, the perspective of intersectionality and its implications for the realization of FSN by different population groups is highlighted. However, this element is not sufficiently expressed in the conceptual framework, which, despite mentioning equity as a key principle related to the accessibility dimension, does not alert to the determinants that condition and restrict the right to adequate food, both regarding race/color, gender, vulnerability, social risk, and sexual orientation. It is suggested to include, in the conceptual framework, the circularity of the food system, understanding it as a central concept related to the dimensions and key principles present in the report.

2.8.6. As examples to illustrate and facilitate the operationalization of the conceptual framework, it is suggested to mention case studies developed under the LUPPA - Urban Laboratory of Food Policy, a project of the Institute for the Food of Tomorrow @comidadoamanha, in partnership with @iclei_sams, whose goal is to support Brazilian cities in achieving healthy urban food systems for people and the planet, resilient to climate and economic vulnerabilities, and promoters of social justice.

2.9. (ii) The report adopts the broader definition of food security (proposed by HLPE in 2020), which includes six dimensions of food security: availability, access, utilization, stability, agency/action, and sustainability. Does the initial draft sufficiently cover the implications of this broader definition in urban and peri-urban food systems?

2.9.1. According to the report, Food and Nutritional Security is a situation that exists when all people, at all times, have physical, social, and economic access to sufficient, safe, and nutritious food that meets their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life (FAO, 2001), and the achievement of SAN can only be achieved if the conditions of all six dimensions of food security developed are met. These dimensions interact with food systems and urban systems to shape the outcomes of SAN.

2.9.2. We believe that the definition of FSN is sufficiently described. We suggest only adding to the concept of FSN some elements present in the Brazilian concept in the Organic Law of Food and Nutritional Security - LOSAN (Law No. 11,346, of September 15, 2006), such as: stating that FSN is the realization of a right for all; that access must be regular and permanent; that access to these foods should not compromise access to other essential needs; and that these foods should be environmentally, culturally, economically, and socially sustainable.

2.9.3. Specifically regarding the concept of sustainability, we believe the definition proposed by Blay-Palmer et al (2020) is interesting, which conceptualizes sustainable food systems at their interface with social, economic, and environmental dimensions. The authors emphasize that inclusive, transparent, participatory, and democratic governance mechanisms are fundamental to sustaining these three dimensions of sustainable food systems. In the social dimension, the authors argue that sustainable food systems need to include the right to food and ensure food and nutritional security, food democracy, fair labor practices, gender equity, social connectivity, cultural self-determination, and rights to natural resources (such as land access). Regarding the economic dimension, sustainable food...
systems would be built on the premise of maintaining equitable economic activities, strengthening short circuits, alternative food networks, cooperatives, communities that support agriculture, and other collaborative networks. In terms of the environmental dimension, sustainable food systems need to incorporate ecological production methods that recognize the importance of agroecology, biodiversity, and renewable resources; protect soil, water, and other resources; and work towards regenerative closed-loop food systems.

2.9.4. Although the key principles listed are central to guiding urban and peri-urban food systems and have been established in previous HLPE reports, it may be useful to include more detailed conceptualization of each with concrete examples for the urban environment. In addition, the inclusion of examples of inspiring experiences of urban and peri-urban food systems that move towards realizing food and nutritional security as defined in the report seems interesting to guide managers and materialize this definition in a practical way.

2.10. (iii) Are the trends/variables/elements identified in the preliminary report the key ones for strengthening urban and peri-urban food systems? If not, what other elements should be considered? Are there other issues related to urban and peri-urban food systems that were not sufficiently addressed in the preliminary report? Are the topics under or over-represented in relation to their importance?

2.10.1. The report states that to strengthen urban food systems, it is crucial to adopt multi-level, multi-stakeholder governance approaches, recognizing the complexity of these systems.

2.10.2. Urban contextual dimensions play a fundamental role in the viability of interventions, influencing the participation of local authorities, partners, and incentive structures. In this sense, understanding the powers of local governments, including the degree of decentralization, mandates, and capacities, is essential.

2.10.3. Stakeholder mapping in urban food systems, which assesses which departments, ministries, and agencies are responsible for different parts of the food systems, and whether they have sufficient budgets and human resources, is an important first step. In cases where mandates are shared among government levels or multiple municipalities in a metropolitan jurisdiction, effective coordination institutions or platforms will be required to enhance policy coherence and transparency.

2.10.4. Civil society's demand for rights can be a powerful normative discourse device to ensure that marginalized groups are included in multi-stakeholder engagements. However, strategies and policy advice on food policies must be protected from political volatility, requiring support from diverse political parties and the building of intergovernmental relationships.

2.10.5. Paths to strengthen urban food systems must be diverse, considering contextual factors and adopting institutional changes aligning with coherent policy instruments. Recognizing the legitimacy of traditional knowledge, including specific knowledge about the environment, sustainable agricultural practices, and other insights significant for the preservation of sociobiodiversity and culture, is essential.
2.11.5. Acknowledging the legitimacy of traditional knowledge is an essential step to promote equity and social justice. Recognizing and respecting this knowledge not only enriches data analysis but also contributes to building more sensitive and effective policies and interventions aligned with the real needs of communities.

2.11.6. During the process of outlining the National Strategy for Food and Nutritional Security in Cities, we adopted some references that may be useful in the presented draft, although the material already encompasses a broad set of references. As a contribution, we highlight the following references:

- Baker and De Zeeuw (2015) conducted a review of urban food policies and programs, presenting an overview of actions implemented in various contexts. This material is available at https://ruaf.org/assets/2019/11/Cities-and-Agriculture.pdf.

- The thematic issue of the Franco-Brazilian Journal of Geography entitled "Food and Food Policies in Cities" can be an interesting and up-to-date reference, providing reflections on the urban food agenda in different territories. The material is available at https://journals.openedition.org/confins/51345.

- Another document that may be useful is the GUIDE FOR PUBLIC MANAGERS: Circular Food Systems in Latin America, by ICLEI, available at https://americadosul.iclei.org/documentos/guia-para-gestores-publicos-sistemas-alimentares-circulares-na-america-latina-2023/. Documents like this, addressing the topic with accessible and practical language, can be interesting to guide public policy formulators.

2.12. (v) Are there redundant facts or statements that could be eliminated from the preliminary draft?

2.12.1. We do not consider that there are redundant facts or statements in the document. However, to enhance presentation and streamline the text, we suggest highlighting the most relevant statements and messages through visual elements such as text boxes and infographics. This approach will not only facilitate content comprehension but also make the reading more engaging and impactful for the target audience. Additionally, it would be interesting to incorporate more examples of best practices/success cases from different regions worldwide with respective websites/contacts to facilitate further information retrieval or clarification of doubts.

2.13. (vi) Could you suggest case studies and success stories from countries that have successfully strengthened urban and peri-urban food systems? In particular, HLPE seeks contributions on:

a) Evidence-based examples of successful interventions in urban and peri-urban food systems, with evidence of which principles made the process effective;

b) Efforts to strengthen activities in urban and peri-urban food systems;

c) Initiatives to strengthen the right to food in urban and peri-urban environments;
d) Examples of circular economy and urban and peri-urban food systems, as well as adaptation and mitigation of climate change, preferably beyond production issues; and

e) Examples of collaboration between national and local governments in urban and peri-urban food systems.

2.13.1. Fortunately, in Brazil, we have some inspiring experiences focused on strengthening urban and peri-urban food systems, such as Belo Horizonte (Minas Gerais), Curitiba (Paraná), and Maricá (Rio de Janeiro). As mentioned earlier, on the LUPPA homepage, more interesting experiences related to food and nutritional security can be found (although not necessarily focusing on the urban and peri-urban food agenda). We also suggest the final report of the Cities and Food project, led by Embrapa Alimentos e Territórios in cooperation with the Delegation of the European Union in Brazil, supported by the Instituto Comida do Amanhã and ICLEI South America. As part of the project, a case study was conducted on sustainable urban food systems in the cities of Curitiba, Maricá, Recife, Rio Branco, and Santarém. Data collection also involved the analysis of organic waste at open-air markets in Curitiba, Recife, and Rio Branco. The publication with the research results can be accessed at this link:


2.13.2. Regarding the inspiring experiences mentioned above, we highlight some key points:

Curitiba, the capital of the Brazilian state of Paraná, has one of the most interesting experiences in urban food supply. Actions include subsidized marketing equipment for healthy foods, urban farms and gardens, and the organization of food production around the city to ensure food reaches urban areas.

Belo Horizonte has a municipal policy for food and nutritional security with well-defined intersectoral governance mechanisms and social participation. These policy actions have been ongoing for 20 years, contributing to the food and nutritional security of the city's residents.

Maricá, in Rio de Janeiro, features various points of food production within the city and a dehydrated food factory that utilizes locally sourced produce from family farming in its entirety, generating income.

In Santarém, Pará, the implementation of the National School Feeding Program strengthens local family farming and locally produced foods.

CONCLUSION

3.1. Faced with the scenario of food insecurity in urban centers and the active role of cities in shaping food systems, scientific evidence and international recommendations shed light on the centrality of the urban and peri-urban food agenda for ensuring food and nutritional security today and for future generations. The commitments made by Brazil in this agenda are strengthened by the contributions of the HLPE report on "Strengthening Urban and Peri-Urban Food Systems to Achieve Food Security and Nutrition in the Context of Urbanization and Rural Transformation."
3.2. The report synthesizes a set of scientific evidence on the topic and provides very important reflections on the complexity of interactions related to food and nutritional security and urban and peri-urban food systems, as well as the challenges related to governance and political processes—essential for guiding policymakers and professionals. Thus, we look forward to following the next stages of the report’s development and await the final publication.
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Within its responsibilities, the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock of Brazil provides the following information:

The conservation, characterization, and use of genetic diversity of plants, animals, and microorganisms in food and agriculture, whether native or exotic, are ensuring options to address current and future challenges. This contributes to food production for the growing global population and helps reduce poverty, ensuring global food security. International conventions and agreements such as the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRFA) highlight government efforts to ensure that the conservation and use of genetic resources remain key elements in efforts to alleviate poverty, increase food security, and provide a safety net for the future of agriculture, whether developed in rural, peri-urban, or urban...
areas. It is emphasized that the National Policy on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (PNRGAA) aims to contribute to international commitments made by Brazil, collaborating with the development of strategies focused on the sustainable, innovative, and competitive use of genetic resources by the Brazilian agricultural sector and towards ensuring food and nutritional security.

Here are some conclusions from the workshop report on "Reduction of Food Loss and Waste: initiatives in agriculture for sustainability," held on November 28, 2023, hosted and coordinated by the Ministry of Agriculture of Brazil. Among the initiatives compiled during the event, attention was drawn to the need for the implementation of public policies aimed at reducing food loss and waste. These actions should address different stages of the food chain, from production to consumption, and involve initiatives such as creating awareness programs, technical training, and training for producers, as well as tax incentives for food donation and the promotion of food reuse. Implementing good practices, adapting these actions to local realities, was also emphasized. The following proposals were presented as suggestions:

1. Promotion of Good Agricultural Practices and Safe Food Production: establish guidelines and programs that encourage the adoption of Good Agricultural Practices (GAP) to ensure the production of safe food, promoting public health and the quality of agricultural products;

2. Use of Adequate Storage Technologies: ensure the quality and safety of agricultural products during storage, minimizing losses and environmental impacts;

3. Advancement and Improvement of the Cold Chain in Agriculture: strengthen and optimize the cold chain in agriculture, promoting technological development, operational efficiency, and ensuring the quality of perishable products from production to the final consumer;

4. Minimization of Losses in the Field and Sustainable Use of Agricultural Surplus: implement strategies to avoid losses in the field and promote the sustainable use of agricultural surplus, contributing to food security, waste reduction, and economic development;

5. Training for Reducing Food Losses in Crop Fields: develop specific training programs for producers, focused on implementing effective practices that reduce food losses in the early stages of agricultural production.

It is also emphasized that irrigated agriculture plays a fundamental role in ensuring food security through agricultural productivity, with a "land-saving" effect for environmental conservation, including in peri-urban areas. This aspect could be worth mentioned in the Report.

Finally, it is worth mention that Brazil has the National Program for Urban and Periurban Agriculture, established by Ordinance No. 467, of 7/2/2018, and updated by Decree No. 11,700 of 12/09/2023, under the Ministry of Agrarian Development. In this context, the program and its recommendations and policy areas could be cited as examples of programs/policies already in place.
After a review of the Draft Zero of the document on "Strengthening urban and peri-urban food systems to achieve food security and nutrition in the context of urbanization and rural transformation" the Permanent representative of the kingdom of Morocco would like to propose the following comments to be considered by the HLPE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General recommendations</th>
<th>Detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide more specific examples of urban and peri-urban food systems</td>
<td>The document could benefit from more concrete examples of how these systems operate in different cities and regions. This would help to make the document more relatable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss the role of technology in urban food systems</td>
<td>Explore how technology is being used to improve the efficiency and sustainability of urban food systems. This could include a discussion of things like food delivery apps, vertical farming, and smart food waste management systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address the challenges of food security and nutrition in urban areas</td>
<td>Delve into the specific challenges that urban residents face in accessing healthy and affordable food. This could include a discussion of things like, poverty, and food insecurity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propose specific policy recommendations for improving urban food systems</td>
<td>Conclude with a set of concrete policy recommendations that could be implemented to improve the sustainability and resilience of urban food systems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Engagement of National Statistical Institutions:**

Encourage active involvement and collaboration with national statistical institutions to address existing statistical gaps. By fostering partnerships with these institutions, the publication can benefit from more comprehensive and accurate data, thereby strengthening the foundation for effective strategies in reducing inequalities. Additionally, this engagement will contribute to heightening the focus of national statistical agencies on food security, ensuring a more nuanced and detailed understanding of related challenges and opportunities.

**Incorporate Measurable Targets within the recommendations:**

Introduce measurable targets and indicators within the recommendations to facilitate monitoring and evaluation, allowing for the assessment of progress in reducing inequalities related to peri-urban food and nutrition security.

**Incorporate More Concrete Examples from diverse regions**

Enrich the report with concrete examples illustrating how addressing inequalities has the potential to advance FSN goals. Real-world cases can help translate theoretical concepts into practical applications, making the report more accessible and compelling.

**Structural recommendations:**

- Consider combining or reorganizing chapters: Chapters 2 and 3 both deal with aspects of the urban context and their impact on food security. Combining them into a single chapter, "Urbanization and its impact on food security and nutrition" could improve flow and reduce redundancy.
- Balance depth and conciseness: While the document requires in-depth exploration of each topic, consider summarizing certain sections, particularly those with extensive subheadings, to improve readability and maintain focus.

**Specific Recommendations by Chapter:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Chapter 1** | - Clearly state the document's objective and target audience in the introduction. Briefly mention the key concepts and framework used in the analysis.  
- Clarify the specific strategies or interventions proposed to meet the conditions of Availability, Accessibility, Utilization, Stability, Agency, and Sustainability.  
- Elaborate on how a food secure population can actively demand and contribute to the achievement of the specified conditions.  
- Elaborate on the opportunity's urbanization presents for livelihoods, improved diets, and increased agency. Include concrete examples of successful interventions or initiatives. |
| **Chapters 2** | - Consider using bullet points or tables to structure key points within subheadings for improved readability. Emphasize the connection between each chapter's findings and overall food security goals.  
- Provide concrete examples or case studies from different contexts to illustrate the bi-directional relationship between global factors and urban and peri-urban Food Security and Nutrition (FSN).  
- Delve into the unique nutritional challenges faced by residents in slum areas within urban and peri-urban settings. Address factors contributing to increased vulnerability in these specific environments. |
| **Chapter 3** | - Provide specific examples of interactions between food systems and urban systems that shape each of the six dimensions of food security.  
- Consider including data or evidence to support the discussion on the variations in components of urban and peri-urban food systems. |
| **Chapter 4** | - include case studies or examples to highlight the substantial variations in components based on urban contexts.  
- Emphasize the importance of understanding urban contexts in coping with global challenges in more concrete terms. |
| **Chapter 5** | - Clearly define the different actors and power dynamics involved in urban food governance. Highlight successful examples of innovative urban food policies. |
• Specify key policy and governance strategies for improving urban and peri-urban FSN.
• Provide examples of successful urban policy or governance strategies and their measurable impacts.

Chapter 6:
• Prioritize and categorize policy recommendations based on their feasibility, impact, and target audience. Provide concrete examples and case studies where applicable.
• Offer more detailed insights into critical reflections on the implementation and assessment of relevant initiatives.
• Discuss specific challenges faced by governance and policy processes and propose innovative solutions.

Chapter 7:
• Briefly summarize the key findings and reiterate the most important recommendations. Conclude with a call to action for policymakers and stakeholders.
• Provide a clear synthesis of findings from previous chapters.
• Offer specific, actionable policy recommendations based on the analysis conducted in the preceding chapters.

Proposal of Additional references

36. Corinna Hawkes, Agrifood Systems and Food Safety Division, FAO, Italy

Dear Paola,

please find the comments made by the FAO Urban Taskteam:

1. The V0 draft introduces a conceptual framework informed by key principles established in previous HLPE-FSN reports (HLPE, 2017; HLPE, 2020).

a) Do you find the proposed framework effective to highlight and discuss the key issues concerning urban and peri-urban food systems?

While the current framework itself is fine, there are comment we would like to make:

- There is room for improvement by expanding the framework by emphasizing the interconnectedness of rural, peri-urban, and urban elements in the framework, and showing that these elements are situated within a broader food system which simultaneously interacts with other ‘systems’ - social, economic, and environmental, in line with the UNFSS and FAO definitions. A clearer picture of the relationships between rural and urban/periurban food systems (urban-rural linkages) will allow for more informed recommendations. Note this refers to rural areas beyond the immediate territory of the city and indeed national boundaries – anywhere from where food is sourced and which may be impacted by urbanization. Our comments are not restricted to rural-urban linkages in the classical sense that it is all about the rural areas just outside of the city. The broader connections need to be understood and articulated. For example, the framework can recognize that the upstream part of food system may, by significant degree, happen in rural areas, regions within and outside national boundaries, something which was mentioned in the last chapters but not in the framework. It can also emphasize how rural transformation shapes U-PU food systems and vice versa, for example in terms of food demand, migration/commute and in the terms of livelihoods. In that sense, the framework can focus on broader understanding of food security and nutrition to showcase opportunities for environmental and social gain in urban food system transformation, themselves essential to support food security over the longer-term as aspects of sustainability - and provide more evidence for that.

- Overall we would encourage the framework to a more solution-oriented, forward-looking approach for policymakers. The overall ‘challenge’ can be framed in terms of urban food systems as drivers of a wider food systems transformation, which itself can be a solution to interconnected crises like climate change, biodiversity loss, pollution, conflict, and poverty. (Also, recommendations on tackling these issues could be integrated into chapters 3, 5, 6, and 7 (e.g. illustrating how urban agriculture, forestry and greenspaces can have a role in mitigating urban heat islands and flooding, livelihood-related shocks and stress etc.) not only in urban but also in peri-urban and nearby rural areas.)

- Additionally, it is recommended to integrate greater consideration of variation in urban contexts based on city typologies (small, intermediary, or metropolitan).
falls short in highlighting the opportunities that small and intermediary cities have to better integrate food systems into urban planning. Therefore, consider adding a dedicated aspect to elucidate the diverse urban contexts associated with metropolitan, small, and intermediary cities. Small cities and towns serve as crucial hubs in strengthening rural-urban connections and facilitating the efficiency of value chains. Megacities with high density pose complexities in the transformation, but intermediary cities where growth is happening present an opportunity to safeguard land suitable for agriculture and truly incorporate food systems into urban planning.

- Finally, incorporating more examples on integration of informality in different UPFS dimensions (e.g. street food vendors, markets, midstream) would offer valuable guidance to policy makers.

b) Is this a useful conceptual framework to provide practical guidance for policymakers?

This largely depends upon the policy makers and what they are looking to implement, but it was highlighted that if we imagine for example, policymakers being assigned to develop a food strategy at the local level, that they could struggle to understand the framework.

With regard to reaching policymakers for the document as a whole, in terms of format and language, consider making the writing style less academic, and including more practical examples and guiding diagrams and boxes that summarize the problematic. If this is not possible, consider developing a more dedicated and succinct version of the product, potentially based on Chapter 6 and the forthcoming Chapter 7, to address policymakers more effectively and acknowledge the complexity of the framework and its potential difficulty for local authority policymakers.

We recognize these comments may appear contradictory to the suggestions above of ensuring a broader approach is taken to understanding food security and nutrition, but believe this could be handled in how the framework is presented.

c) Can you offer suggestions for examples to illustrate and facilitate the operationalization of the conceptual framework to address issues relevant for FSN?

We agree that incorporating more practical examples is key, and also examples that illustrate diversity of U-PU systems. These examples can inspire policymakers by showcasing experiences from different cities. Especially in Chapter 5, you could reduce the current extensive discussion to include robust discussion on practical steps and strategies for implementation, to emphasize action and implementation. Likewise, you can consider illustrating Section 1.4 with more examples, similar to the approach in the next chapters, to make it more accessible and practical for policymakers.

- The document could include more evidence/examples on the impact of COVID-19 pandemic on urban food systems, and here is one FAO project to consider to incorporate:
Country: Bangladesh (project reference: OSRO/BGD/008/WFP ) Title: Food security for households most affected by the COVID-19 crisis in at-risk low-income urban areas. Objective: To address the food security needs of selected beneficiaries in at-risk low-income urban areas of Dhaka and smaller urban municipalities near Dhaka, with a focus on establishing linkages with local smallholder farmers in semi-rural and rural areas of Dhaka North City Corporation. Link to the story (under the sub-title ‘Getting city farmers to grow and eat more vegetables)

- You can further emphasize promoting job opportunities with decent working conditions for food-insecure households within U-PU food systems, and critical questions regarding formalizing informal workers and increasing living incomes and wages in the U-PU food sectors.

- Include detailed examples of how cities are crafting comprehensive food strategies and policies and, implementing them through inclusive governance and food policy councils. Consider linking specific case studies, such as the Mexico City canteen example (its award-winning case study) or the approach adopted by Bordeaux Metropole and its food policy (council) [Bordeaux says yes to its new food policy](https://eurocities.eu/stories/bordeaux-says-yes-to-its-new-food-policy/).

- Explore existing solutions in Latin America that support business formalization and greater access to social protection, such as Monotax (Uruguay) or Monotributo (Argentina).

2. The report adopts the broader definition of food security (proposed by the HLPE-FSN in 2020), which includes six dimensions of food security: availability, access, utilization, stability, agency and sustainability.

1. Does the V0 draft cover sufficiently the implications of this broader definition in urban and peri-urban food systems?

The ‘utilization’ and ‘stabilization’ dimensions are the least addressed, thus it is suggested to give more attention to these dimensions in the report. It would be helpful to explain/define what these dimensions concretely means in the context of UPFS, and clarify the connection between food safety, dietary diversity, and ‘utilization’ dimension. Additionally, further elaboration on the ‘agency’ dimension is crucial, particularly as it is interconnected with addressing inequalities, a significant driver of disparity. You can provide examples of strategies that enhance awareness and agency, enabling these communities to actively shape their own food security and well-being. Connect examples with case studies rather than academic papers for a more practical illustration, such as highlighting how self-help groups in rural India and structures like Stokvels in South Africa and Chamas in Kenya contribute to long-term food security outcomes for U-PU residents.

3. Are the trends/variables/elements identified in the draft report the key ones to strengthen urban and peri-urban food systems? If not, which other elements should be considered?
a) Are there any other issues concerning urban and peri-urban food systems that have not been sufficiently covered in the draft report?

- Trends/variables/elements around shocks and resilience:

Consider incorporating more evidence and examples of the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on urban food systems to strengthen the resilience aspect. Acknowledge the urgent need to reinforce resilience in the face of various shocks, including climate-related events, pandemics, and global economic crises. Emphasize the vulnerability of both urban and periurban food systems, disrupted supply chains, and the consequent impact on urban food security.

Links:

- FAO policy brief on urban food systems and COVID-19
- Key results from the FAO global survey “Urban Food Systems and COVID-19”

For Chapters 2 and 3, particularly Sections 2.4 and 3.2, consider a broader consideration of contexts, specifically incorporating discussions on fragile settings and protracted food crisis situations. Highlight opportunities that emerge when individuals with rural food and agriculture livelihoods are displaced or migrate to cities, presenting unique possibilities for food systems and related urban contexts.

In Chapters 5, 6, and 7, include risk-sensitive policies and practices, as urban and peri-urban areas face higher exposure and vulnerabilities. Develop risk-informed and shock-responsive social protection schemes, nature-based solutions, and risk-proofed infrastructures and services to enhance the resilience and sustainability of urban food systems.

- Trends on urban jobs:

Highlight the critical and insufficiently presented points for how U-PU food systems could reduce poverty and inequalities. Emphasize aspects like greater job creation, decent working conditions, improved access to social services, and community empowerment in urban settings.

- The key role of local and regional governments:

It is recommended to underscore the crucial role of local governments in advancing sustainable urban food systems, and strategies that enhance the recognition of local governments in global, regional, and national food systems agendas should be included.

- Trends regarding ecosystem services:

Ecosystem services from UPA have been well described, but there is one service that has not been mentioned, and that is the capacity of agricultural areas to allow water to infiltrate aquifers. In the
case of the city of Abidjan for example, agricultural fields allow water infiltration, which prevents saline water in the aquifer (consequence of the sea level rise).

- Other remarks:
  - In Section 3.2.1, Figure 3.2 and the related comments should be eliminated as they refer to outdated, preliminary, not validated and not cross-country comparable data.
  - In Section 3.2.2, it would be good to distinguish between food insecurity by gender of the individuals (like the one included in SOFI), and by gender of the head of the household like many case studies mentioned later in the text.

b) Are topics under- or over-represented in relation to their importance?

- It is recommended to emphasize the integration of food systems into existing planning and regulations and development of specific ordinances dedicated to urban and peri-urban food systems. Integrating food systems into local development plans secures national funding allocation, contributing to overall sustainability (refer to SOFI 2023 and FAO-UCL's "Integrating Food into Urban Planning, 2018"). A dedicated paragraph on the integration of food systems into urban and territorial planning is suggested.

- Emphasize the point and provide examples on establishing partnerships with non-state actors, particularly private-public partnerships, which is crucial for unleashing the potential power of cities.

- Consider providing additional information and examples to underscore the statement that not all components of the system are equally vulnerable to climate shocks, especially small-scale and informal actors.

- Elevate the importance of cross-country and peer-to-peer learning as a powerful tool to encourage learning among cities and country representatives to foster increased participation in mainstreaming food systems in policies, planning, and actions.

- Better highlight the growing connectivity and interlinkages across urban, peri-urban, and rural areas, referencing SOFI 2023. Address the issue of context specificity, ensuring a balanced perspective that includes diverse regions, particularly highlighting specificities like Small Island Developing States (SIDS).

- Ensure Chapter 3.5 encompasses a broader scope, considering multiple shocks and stresses with systemic and territorial implications. Rename section 3.5 to "Multiple Shocks and Stresses Threatening and Impacting Urban and Peri-Urban Areas" to accurately represent the comprehensive nature of challenges faced by urban, peri-urban, and rural areas.

4. Is there additional quantitative or qualitative data that should be included?
a) Are there other references, publications, or traditional or different kind of knowledges, which should be considered?

- The ESA/ESP/ESS recent study on workers in agrifood systems could be used to illustrate the context of U-PU food systems, as the data are disaggregated per rural-urban peri-urban settings.

5. Are there any redundant facts or statements that could be eliminated from the V0 draft?

It would be good to differentiate and establish clearer links, especially regarding food environment factors, as there appears to be potential overlap between certain points in sections 3.4 and 4.2.

We also have some additional comments about the structure of the document

- Consider incorporating ‘decentralization’ in the “urban contexts” circle illustrated in Fig 1.4.
- Consider renaming Chapter 4 to explicitly reflect the question it addresses: "What aspects of urban and peri-urban food systems need strengthening to achieve urban and peri-urban food security and nutrition?" This adjustment can create a clearer connection between the chapter's content and its overarching purpose.
- Consider switching the order of Chapters 3 and 4, placing the comprehensive exploration of urban and peri-urban food systems in Chapter 4 before discussing challenges and dynamics in Chapter 3.
- In Chapters 4, 5, and 6, which have already integrated methods for applying the conceptual framework, consider revising the titles to better reflect the primary questions the report aims to answer.
In Chapter 4, consider restructuring point 4.6.3 as the entire point 4.6., focusing on key elements of food systems nodes, while merging points 4.6.2, 4.6.4, and 4.6.6 into section 3.5 on shocks and stresses threatening and affecting food security and nutrition. Handle diversity under 4.6.5 separately due to its importance for resilience, food security, and nutrition.

6. Could you suggest case studies and success stories from countries that were able to strengthen urban and peri-urban food systems? In particular, the HLPE-FSN would seek contributions on:

a) evidence-based examples of successful interventions in urban and peri-urban food systems with the principles behind what made the process work;

- Box 18 of SOFI 2023
- School Feeding programmes in Senegal (Bambilor and Khourgeul)
- Agroecological fair in Portoviejo, Ecuador

- Towards the high-quality development of City Region Food Systems: Emerging approaches in China
- BOX 16 SOFI 2023: Local agrifood systems strategies linking large metropolitan areas with rural hinterland in Antananarivo, Nairobi and Quito
- https://eatrightindia.gov.in/eatsmartcity/home
- https://foodtrails.milanurbanfoodpolicypact.org/cities/
- The city examples in this webinar series we developed are interesting https://foodfoundation.org.uk/fc22-emergency-food-planning
- The FAO Office of Emergency and Resilience primarily focuses on addressing food insecurity and malnutrition in fragile or protracted food crisis situations, encompassing countries affected by multiple crises such as conflicts, extreme weather events, and socio-economic disturbances. Operations extend to regions like Iraq, Syria, Bangladesh, and Nigeria, each with distinct objectives:

- **Iraq: OSRO/IRQ/902/EC**
  
  Objective: Contribute significantly to the sustainable food and agricultural livelihood security of rural and peri-urban populations in Ninevah Governorate.

- **Syria: UNJP/SYR/025/UNJ**
  
  Objective: Strengthen urban and rural resilience and conditions for recovery by enhancing the capacity of local authorities, civil society, and communities to develop evidence-based policies and resilience programs.

- **Nigeria (Three Projects):**
*Restoring livelihoods of vulnerable populations to catastrophic food and nutrition insecurity in BAY*

*Emergency food security and livelihood assistance to conflict-affected populations in Northeast Nigeria*

*Improved production, availability, and access to nutritious food for vulnerable IDPs, returnees, and host communities*

Common focus: Target populations with limited access to land, providing inputs for urban and peri-urban gardening to diversify diets and generate income.

- **Somalia: "UN Joined Work on Building Resilience in Somalia"**

Output 3: Households and producer groups supported to diversify and enhance livelihoods for improved income.

Activities involve working with communities in each district to identify options for diversification in rural, peri-urban, and urban areas, particularly focusing on women's roles and minimizing risks. Examples include honey/beekeeping, poultry-raising, dairy production, and vegetable and fruit gardening.

b) efforts made to enhance agency in urban and peri-urban food systems;

- Consider citing the illustrative example outlined on page 133 of SOFI 2023, which discusses "Sub-national agrifood systems governance agreements among metropolitan, intermediary, and small cities in Peru." Lima has established the Food System Council of Metropolitan Lima (CONSIAL). The council has enacted several local ordinances to promote healthier urban food environments, urban agriculture, the use of public spaces for agroecology farmers' markets, and the recovery of unsold food in wholesale markets. [https://foodfoundation.org.uk/sites/default/files/2022-05/Surat_Citizen%20engagement%20presentation.pdf](https://foodfoundation.org.uk/sites/default/files/2022-05/Surat_Citizen%20engagement%20presentation.pdf)

c) efforts made to enhance the right to food in urban and peri-urban settings;

d) examples of circular economy and urban and peri-urban food system and climate change adaptation and mitigation, preferably beyond issues of production; and

- Consider looking into the example related to food waste and circularity in Nairobi City County by visiting the following link: [https://www.fao.org/urban-food-agenda/news-events/news-detail/en/c/1473546/](https://www.fao.org/urban-food-agenda/news-events/news-detail/en/c/1473546/).

- Consider the example of New York City: Mayor Adams of NYC has committed to reduce city's food-based emissions by 33% by 2020, linked to NYC's integrated greenhouse has inventory, which incorporates emissions from the production and consumption of food, developed by the Mayor's Office of Climate.[Mayor's Office of Climate](https://www.fao.org/)

e) examples of national and local government collaboration on urban and peri-urban food systems.
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GENERAL COMMENTS ON THE V0 DRAFT OF THE HLPE-FSN REPORT

The Civil Society and Indigenous Peoples’ Mechanism (CSIPM) welcomes the V0 Draft of the HLPE-FSN report on "Strengthening urban and peri-urban food systems to achieve food security and nutrition in the context of urbanisation and rural transformation". The CFS had a policy workstream on Urbanization and Rural Transformation and Implications for Food Security and Nutrition but despite many efforts and resources dedicated to this workstream, and although there was a consultation process, it did not result in a final negotiated policy document. For this reason, the CSIPM welcomes an HLPE report on this topic.

37. Teresa Maisano, Civil Society Mechanism (CSM) for relations with the UN Committee on World Food Security CFS, Italy

The Civil Society and Indigenous Peoples' Mechanism (CSIPM) for relations with the United Nations Committee on World Food Security (CFS) is the largest international space of civil society organisations (CSOs) working to eradicate food insecurity and malnutrition. All participating organizations in the CSIPM belong to one of the following 11 constituencies: smallholder farmers, pastoralists, fisherfolk, Indigenous Peoples, agricultural and food workers, landless, women, youth, consumers, urban food insecure and NGOs. This collective written contribution has been prepared by participants from the CSIPM Urban and Peri-Urban Working Group which was constituted in January 2024 to follow this CFS workstream.

Explore a case study on public food procurement in Ecuador (Manabi province and Portoviejo city) through the following links:
- Video 1: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RQLLhzhgReY
- Video 2: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UuyI9D1698o&amp;t=141s
- Consider referencing SOFI 2023 chapter 5.3 for further insights.
- Please note that FAO is developing guidelines on multi-level food systems governance, compiling various good practices.
- BOX 16 SOFI 2023: Local agrifood systems strategies linking large metropolitan areas with rural hinterland in Antananarivo and Quito
- Colombia Alianza por el Buen Vivir https://www.concejodemedellin.gov.co/la-alianza-por-el-buen-vivir-es-fundamental-para-el-desarrollo-de-la-ciudad-region/ The current status of this initiative is unknown, but the objective was to bring together municipal, provincial and national governments together to improve food systems in the region. If this has stopped working in recent years, that could also be an example for lessons learnt.
- https://foodfoundation.org.uk/sites/default/files/2022-05/Pune%20%20The%20Food%20Economy%20presentation.pdf
and sees the opportunity to raise awareness of the priorities of the most affected constituencies in urban and peri-urban contexts through this work stream.

This six-chapter report provides a definition of urban and peri-urban food systems in the first chapter, followed by a historical perspective on the process of urbanization, the current context of urban growth and the number of people living in urban areas in food insecurity. The third chapter examines the nutritional transition and food security, and how the human right to food can be guaranteed. The fourth chapter analyses urban and peri-urban food systems, addressing the different processes, actors, and how people access food, such as through reliance on supermarkets and the proliferation of convenience stores. The fifth chapter discusses urban food governance, laws, an urban food policy, the different regional actors, and how participation in urban policy takes place. Chapter six discusses policy partnerships, and the different actors involved in these responses, as well as international issues and the international market.

The CSIPM recognises that one of the important aspects of the HLPE-FSN report is that it builds its conceptualisation on the six dimensions of food security: availability, access, utilisation, stability, agency and sustainability.

Furthermore, we also find it positive how the report differentiates between the urban and peri-urban concept for the global north and the global south to recognise the different ways in which poverty, migration and internal inequalities have increased in each country. We also welcome the fact that the report talks about malnutrition, given the impact of the penetration of ultra-processed products in urban and peri-urban contexts.

However, we also see some weaknesses and spaces for improvement, such as the fact that the report does not look at the human right to food and the different dimensions of human rights in a holistic way. The report should elaborate more on the indivisibility and interconnection between the right to and the right to the city, or to housing, or the right to work and social protection, or the right to a healthy, clean, safe and sustainable environment. There is a very limited section on addressing gender or inequalities that could be expanded, and which could benefit from previous CFS policy outcomes as a reference, especially the “Voluntary Guidelines on Gender Equality and Women’s and Girls Empowerment in the Context of Food Security and Nutrition”. The report should also focus more on youth as agents of transformation in urban and peri-urban food systems. Young people are vital to achieving economies of wellbeing defined by food sovereignty, dignified livelihoods, and healthy environments in rural and urban areas. Food systems transformations are urgently needed to ensure that youth can live well in the countryside and cities, restore ecological harmony, and receive fair remuneration for their work in food systems. Young people are often forced to migrate to cities because life in rural areas is made impossible by structural constraints. Systemic shifts in food systems should centre the core principles of rights, equity, agency, and recognition of the role of youth as collective and individual protagonists of social change.

The report could also benefit from an additional section in chapter 4 looking at existing alternatives to supermarkets and convenience stores, such as territorial markets, community supported agriculture,
food buying groups and cooperatives. There must also be an examination of the proliferation of charitable food aid provision in a variety of settings from food banks to schools and religious spaces.

While urban and peri-urban agriculture is addressed, the report does not consider agroecology as a transformative approach for urban and peri urban systems. Among the CFS documents we have a basis for moving forward on urban and peri-urban agriculture based on agroecology and the report should refer to the FAO 10 principles of Agroecology and the CFS Policy Recommendations. There is also an increasing body of research on Urban Agroecology and recognition of its practices and values, that address power and injustice, provide social and wellbeing benefits beyond the production of food and embraces a variety of holistic low impact, low input sustainable food production methods. Some references are provided below.

Moreover, there is no systemic and connected vision between political systems and public procurement services, for example with regard to procurement programmes, there is nothing about a public procurement network. With regard to governance, the report does not touch on urban planning and management instruments, it only calls on social participation councils, but not with the objective to put the food perspective as transversal in the design of urban planning instruments, such as the budget, the urban infrastructure and the different existing public services.

For the CSIPM, social participation is key to create urban and peri-urban food systems that can impact malnutrition and food insecurity. The most affected people and constituencies - such as gypsy, Roma and traveller communities, youth, refugees, migrants, pastoralists, peasants, homeless people, low income groups, including women, racialised people and ethnic groups, persons with disabilities, older people and children among others living in urban and peri-urban areas- should be included in policy making spaces through transparent, democratic and effective processes that respect the autonomy and self-organizations of social movements, feminist movements and civic movements. For example, there is an absence of the workers’ perspective, and the perspective of the social and solidarity economy and social protection that consider the conditions for providing quality of life.

ASSUMPTIONS THAT SHOULD BE CHALLENGED (SHIFTING THE PARADIGM)

- The urbanization paradigm, and modernization itself, that requires living in cities away from rural areas. It is well documented that urbanisation often leads to the very problems it is aiming to solve: poor housing, overcrowding, unemployment, poverty and destitution, food insecurity, health disparities, traffic congestion, pollution, lack of proper infrastructure such as a good food environment, schools, transport, water, energy and sewage.
- Many developed countries still retain a very significant proportion of their total population in rural areas. For instance, countries like Austria, Poland, Slovakia, Ireland and Thailand, among many others, have rural populations of above 40% - close to 50% in some cases. These are indeed real-life examples of countries where the trend does not align with the paradigm, but these examples are often ignored. In China, the successful rural regeneration programme includes many young people and has a strong dimension of Community Supported Agriculture with a key focus on territorial markets.
- Strengthening territorial markets is key, as rather than focusing on international trade which can have negative consequences and impacts in food security in rural and urban areas and should be further explored.
- Cities are expanding through urban sprawl. Within and around cities, there were fertile areas for agriculture that have now been converted to built up areas in an alarming manner. It is essential to maintain peri-urban agriculture (using the VGGT where possible), in order to ensure access to fresh nutritious produce for local populations. Furthermore, the rural-urban linkages are critical.
- The report should take the fact that the urban context is not homogenous and has interconnected institutions or networks made up of different actors who should be taken into consideration. Food security and food sovereignty initiatives, as well as governance and food policy to promote access to food, should pay attention to the different needs, priorities and preferences of the various groups that make up the cities. The urban context includes refugees, immigrants, and different socio-economic classes.

**WHAT IS MISSING OR COULD BE STRENGTHENED**

- Private sector engagement has led to increased production and availability of ultra-processed foods becoming widely available in the urban areas and also widely distributed through food banks. The report should answer the question of how to promote localized food systems and territorial markets in urban contexts to ensure access to affordable, healthy and culturally acceptable diets to consumers. The connection between access to ultra-processed foods and health should be further explored given the rise in consumption of processed foods. On the issue of communal norms and cultural food practices, the report should examine how these influence consumption patterns in urban areas.
- In Pakistan 65% of population is composed of youth, how can we involve them in this process? Youth make up a large segment of the urban population and rural-urban transition is on the rise. The potential of youth as actors in the food system in urban areas is crucial and could be further explored. Understanding the context is key, as this baseline study in Uganda shows.
- Two elements not well addressed in the report are: social function of public procurement services and food provision. This dimension is often absent from analyses but needs to be considered as essential to ensuring food security and food sovereignty. This has been a key focus in Europe in recent years. The International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI) together with partners such as Slow Food and Urgenci has worked extensively on this question. As the Manifesto for establishing minimum standards for public canteens across the EU. This was also a key part of the work of the European Food Policy Coalition. An excellent example of school organic public procurement using municipal land is the project Une cantine 100 % bio sans surcoût.
- During the pandemic, we saw how the public supply network and public markets were important to ensure access to adequate food. It is necessary to support the creation of pacts also between municipalities, as they can create pacts and agreements at the national and local level. For example, in Brazil the creation of the national strategy for food security and urban context which intends to create local policies between different actors.
The draft is well developed and presents an elaborated description of food security issues in urban and peri-urban areas. However, the concepts of gender and inequality are largely missing from the analysis. Although the report mentions gender briefly as a cross-cutting issue, the report could benefit greatly by developing an inequality framework or proposal on how to address gender, racial, social and economic inequalities when talking about food security in urban and peri-urban areas. An intersectional feminist framework would promote an understanding of the reasons behind disparities and inequalities in the access and distribution of food, as well as social impacts of these inequalities. See HLPE 18 on Reducing Inequalities for Food Security and Nutrition.

Urban areas comprise a large population living in poverty and its impacts affect food security of families and communities, especially women and girls and underserved communities. Moreover, existing literature largely documents that women within families tend to experience more food insecurity, especially during shocks. Therefore, the report should take this into consideration. There is a component of analysis that relates to agency (empowerment), but it is not extensive.

Furthermore, the mention of women and gender in the report appears in relation to the children and their role as mothers in addressing the challenges of the children’s food insecurity. The report does not offer a critical reflection on the roles of other actors in the nutrition of children, the positive contribution and value of women in the preparation of food and the time dedicated to feed the family.

The report should also include a greater focus on widespread practices that contributed significantly to ensuring food security and food sovereignty during the pandemic and the post-pandemic period. Some of these experiences are synthesized in the CSIPM report Voices from the ground: From COVID-19 to radical transformation of our food systems (2020). As well as Enacting Resilience: the Response of LSPA to the Covid-19 Crisis (2021), a significant report published by Urgenci that underlines the importance and relevance of peri-urban agriculture in feeding urban populations. What is clear in both these reports is the birth of spontaneous solidarity-based, bottom-up citizens’ initiatives that made key contributions to ensuring access and the Right to Food and Nutrition.

There is no real exploration of land use, including access to land and tenureship for urban and peri urban food producers, regeneration and its impacts.

There is no understanding of urban and peri urban food systems, and particularly food production in the planning and emergency resilience of cities. Prior to the Covid-19 pandemic there was a lack of preparedness or planning for shocks in the food system for many cities with a reliance on the market to ensure food availability.

For the CSIPM there is still more work to do regarding governance. For example, how municipalities can preserve and build more physical and social infrastructure in areas of deprivation. As well as better engagement with marginalised groups who do not participate in the mainstream food system. There could be more from a legal point of view on how municipalities can create agreements and laws to improve infrastructure and supply. Some key examples of how this can be done are: https://securite-sociale-alimentation.org/ Other examples exist in Brazil and other countries.

It would also be important for the report to include an analysis on loss and waste of food in markets and supermarkets, problems are linked to the just in time system, transport, storage,
and the confusing labelling systems of best before, and use by dates that mean that edible food is disposed of before its expiry date. Large quantities of food are also disposed of at source to control prices, such as milk; or to meet supermarket cosmetic standards, or in the home. The report could also provide recommendations on mechanisms that provide better information through scientific recommendations, and that can be useful for many populations, in order to reduce food waste. Studies have demonstrated the fact that food loss and waste are significantly lower in direct consumer food systems such as Community Supported Agriculture (CSA), as the one on **Food loss and waste in community-supported agriculture in the region of Leipzig, Germany**. There are various explanations for this, especially the extensive use of agroecology in CSA, the proximity of CSA to consumers (both physical and psychological), the fact that consumers always accept all fruit and vegetables, irrespective of size or shape, so no grading and rejection processes exist.

- **Food sovereignty** is a concept that does not appear in the report, but it is very important if we take into account the territorial or local perspectives and the agency aspect of food security. We must underline the importance of consumers, who must recognise themselves in the food they eat.

- The report could also include recommendations with regard to the role of public authorities, for example from the ministries of health and agriculture as well as recommendations on local agroecological/organic production for territorial public procurement.

- Access to and the protection of land; and the succession of existing farms for new forms of collectives and cooperatives, such as community farms in urban and peri-urban areas should be prioritized.

- It would also be important to include in the report an analysis on oligopolies in terms of agriculture, as we see the same in terms of retail globally. Also public goods and wholesale markets.

- The report needs to be clear regarding where agricultural food production places in urban and peri-urban contexts, such as the promotion of community gardens, allotment backyard gardens using limited space, technologies such as vertical farming, hydroponics, rooftop farming, among others.

- Also, it should address how the deficit in local production and reliance on importation have an impact on urban and peri-urban food systems.

- Community Land Trusts and their equivalents need to be recognised by the report as a means of preserving urban and peri-urban agriculture. This form of preservation is very common in New York and increasingly in the United Kingdom, and is recognised in UN Habitat 2. It is a key form of solidarity economy regarding land usage, and is linked to [Local Government legislation](http://www.fao.org/fsnforum).

- We consider it important to emphasize the fact that certain food consumption and production networks that are below the radar have not been taken into account in the report. There should be an extensive look at existing alternatives to long food chains, including Community Supported Agriculture, producers’ and consumers collectives and cooperative shops, small-scale producers collectives of various kinds, and distributive platforms like the Open Food Network, on-line collective producers’ sales (including criteria such as agroecology/organic production). As well as informal trading networks such as the suitcase trade, often black market, between global south and global north in culturally acceptable food products.
• Food Policy Councils are key to developing successfully sustainable urban and peri-urban agriculture and there needs to be an extensive section developed on this subject.
• It would be important to explore the food, climate and humanitarian nexus in the urban context. How cities are prepared to respond to shocks and humanitarian emergencies, and build long-term resilience in a climate crisis context. Examples are initiatives on early warning systems in Nairobi, Kenya and a similar project in Philippines-B-Ready project.

We need to emphasize the alternatives that do exist are in many cases deeply anchored, and whose resilience during the pandemic was shown to be invaluable, such as in Brazil, where small scale food producers gave food to people free of charge. As documented in the CSIPM report (2022) Voices from the ground 2: transformative solutions to the global systemic food crises.

• The French and Belgian experimental food social security trials which are currently underway with the basis of food as a human right and as social protection. There is a reference to the French trials in the report to UCLG, which is possibly the first time that a Local Government network has been referenced in the CFS work.
• Rural regeneration policy in China, where CSA plays a considerable role should also be referenced. The interesting aspect in China is that there is far less of an issue of access to land, due to the fact that all rural families have a land allocation
• Food policy councils, and the very interesting work being done now in New York City, Toronto, London and other cities should be highlighted. See Milan Urban Food Policy Pact website for examples

OTHER REFERENCES WHICH COULD BE CONSIDERED


URBAN AGROECOLOGY REFERENCES

• Urban Agroecology: Principles and Potential https://edepot.wur.nl/448775
• Sustainable Urbanisation Global Initiative (SUGI)/Food-Water-Energy Nexus https://jpi-urbaneurope.eu/calls/sugi/
• Resourcing an Agroecological Urbanism: Political, Transformational and Territorial Dimensions. Edited By Chiara Tornaghi, Michiel Dehaene
38. Willem Janssen, retiree from the Urban Unit of the World Bank

Let me start by congratulating you and all the other members of the team on a very good piece of work. The report is super-well documented, incorporates many perspectives on urban food systems, and reviews many dimensions of it. It is a tour-de-force which is coming together well. In what follows I would like to make a few suggestions that reflect my own engagement with the topic and I hope they are useful for the team.

1. Regarding question 1 on the conceptual framework, I am in two minds. The conceptual framework elaborates in more than sufficient detail the different dimensions of urban food systems and it will be very useful for any scholar that wants to understand an urban food system anywhere. In this respect I was very happy with the report.

What the report and the conceptual framework do not achieve is a sense of urgency, of why this issue needs attention. Would there be a way to start the report with a summary of some of the biggest problems that have been observed, and then illustrate those problems with some numbers? I would expect the following problems to come up high, at the least in the developing world: waste, lack of hygiene and outbreak of food born diseases; unbalanced diets, certainly in the lower income strata, and resulting malnutrition; excessively high food prices in urban spots, because of poor logistics and insufficient local competition. But maybe I am wrong, and the biggest problems are different ones, if so fine.

By all means, the team might wish to consider what it wants to achieve. To lay out the analytics of urban food systems or to draw attention to a hot, urgent upcoming issue, create buy-in, and outline a way forward........

2. I was not particularly convinced of the need for six dimensions of food security, the former three were actually good enough for me. With the six dimensions, the risk is that the analysis dies in sophistication (paralysis through analysis). The report should not be about the implications of a broader definition, but about the implications of ongoing urbanization on food security. The more the report focuses on the real life issues instead of the definitions, the better.

3. I find the subjects treated in the report very relevant. There is maybe one issue that may need more attention, and that is food preparation by poor urban households. In my view, the urban food system does not end when the food reaches the consumer, but only after the food is prepared and consumed. I would guess that poor food preparation contributes a lot to bad nutrition outcomes but also to other health problems, such as air pollution in and outside the house, and to fire risks. If food preparation is difficult, a lot of improvements earlier in the urban food system may go to waste.

4. Finally, it would be fantastic if the report spelled out a way-forward. Such a way-forward might be split up in a few action areas:

   a. the research agenda: what are the issues where understanding is lacking? How can those be addressed?
b. data and information: how could the data availability on urban food systems be improved, so that better decisions can be made?

c. investment frameworks: what are, in general, the most important type of investments that are required to improve urban food systems, are those in the realm of the public or the private sector?

d. governance and policy: what are the type of policies that have shown success in different cities? How were they brought about?

e. the yardsticks of success: how can we see that the urban food system of one city is better than that of another city? And also, how can we measure the success of possible “urban food system improvement programs”?

Best regards,

Willem

---

39. Sabrina Alfonsi, Councillor for agriculture, environment and waste cycle of the city of Rome, Comune di Roma, Italy

Dalle stime ONU sappiamo che oggi, la questione cruciale del cibo si concentra particolarmente nelle aree urbane dove vive più della metà della popolazione mondiale e che questa quota supererà i due terzi della popolazione mondiale, determinando grandi sfide per le amministrazioni cittadine.

Di fronte a questo quadro in evoluzione, è cruciale che gli enti locali realizzino sistemi agroalimentari sostenibili ed inclusivi e che potenzino nuovi modelli di governance volti a favorire un consumo consapevole ed una produzione agroecologica, in modo da assicurare il diritto umano al cibo e per poter mettere a segno gli Obiettivi di Sviluppo Sostenibile contenuti nell’Agenda ONU 2030.

Roma è una delle 27 città italiane che ha firmato il “Patto di Milano” (MUFP), l’eredità forse più importante di Expo 2015, che promuove un approccio di pianificazione alimentare per rispondere alle sfide sociali, ambientali ed economiche che l’agricoltura e l’alimentazione si trovano esattamente di fronte.

Il cibo può rivelarsi un elemento strategico che plasma la forma e la sostanza di una città e che orienta in modo consapevole la comunità che la vive.

Produzione, trasformazione, distribuzione e consumo sono aspetti della catena del cibo da amalgamare con la salute delle persone e la tutela dell’ambiente.

Il cibo come politica urbana implica una scelta essenziale: quella di “fare sistema” attorno al ciclo dell’agroalimentare.
Di fronte alle sfide del nostro tempo, l'agricoltura urbana e periurbana può giocare un ruolo da protagonista e passare ad essere da settore marginale, architrave di sviluppo e di crescita.

Il Piano del Cibo deve diventare parte integrante della programmazione urbana ed agire con un approccio sistemico, multisettoriale e multiscale, nel quale rientrino una serie di politiche pubbliche relative alla pianificazione del territorio, alla distribuzione degli alimenti, alla accessibilità al cibo, alla gestione dei rifiuti alimentari, e al riciclo.

Per fare questo Roma ha messo in campo un processo unico a livello mondiale attraverso la costituzione nata dal basso del Consiglio del Cibo costituitosi formalmente lo scorso 27 ottobre in occasione della III conferenza agricola cittadina del Comune di Roma.

Il tema generale del cibo incontra inevitabilmente a Roma, città agricola più grande d'Europa con i suoi 60.000 ettari, quello dell'agricoltura.

Per rilanciare questo settore nella nostra città, sempre in occasione della III conferenza agricola è stato pubblicato un bando per assegnare terre pubbliche inutilizzate a giovani agricoltori.

Dopo i primi lotti per oltre 70 ettari si procederà nel corso del 2024 e a seguire alla messa a bando di altre 15 aree sulle quali si sta effettuando un censimento

Un'altra grande esperienza in città è quella rappresentata dagli oltre 140 orti urbani che anche grazie al progetto RU:URBAN ha permesso a Roma di essere riconosciuta a livello europeo come “Good Practice City”

L'agricoltura urbana può ridurre l'impatto delle ondate di calore sulla salute, riducendo l'impronta di carbonio delle città.

In una ottica quindi di capacitazione di comunità e di sussidiarietà circolare, gli orti urbani comunitari nel governo della città possono essere veri hub per diverse politiche pubbliche verdi nonché percorsi d'inclusione sociale di persone con problemi di isolamento, dipendenza, esclusione.

https://www.milanurbanfoodpolicypact.org/
https://www.comune.roma.it/web/it/bando-concorso.page?contentId=BEC1102886
http://www.gardeniser.it/
https://www.comune.roma.it/web/it/notizia.page?contentId=NWS1103136
40. Ana Maria Huaita Alfaro, Independent, Peru

**Question 1 - About the conceptual framework**

- The definition of urban and peri urban food systems could be slightly improved to have a clearer opening of the report.

These are now described in relation to activities (p.7) but it can be expanded - also building on the reference from Tefft et al, 2021 – to include actors, institutions and environments. It is still a complex concept so I would be in favour of adding a scheme or a series of images next to this paragraph.

Moreover, a broader explanation of these systems could come earlier in the report, it would imply a change in the structure but may be beneficial in guiding the following arguments.

- To better develop the complexity of U-PU systems, I would consider revising the current framework in the light of other key topics connecting food and cities.

I think it can help in making clearer how do U-PU systems connect to everyday life aspects for general readers, and how their challenges can be tackled in strategic interventions bringing about benefits in more than one ‘dimension’, for decision makers.

This need to identify emerging key topics becomes evident when you come across certain sections that are not well developed (i.e. online food retail). Some elements can be introduced within a broader explanation (for example, urban food supply and distribution and the different types of food retail). Following this, the most relevant aspects / entry points for action can be expanded (i.e. territorial markets for food nutrition in contexts of high vulnerability to food insecurity; information and regulation of the midstream; etc.).

- Taking the case of markets to think through food and cities:

When describing markets in their roles for strengthening urban and peri urban food systems (as raised in p.46), the argument can be improved by highlighting the dimensions in which these impact – which go beyond the supply role that is well explained and which also impact on conditions of food security.

These dimensions can be identified in relation to key urban challenges, such as:

- the strengthening of local economies
- the development of territorial linkages
- the planning of sustainable / green cities
- governance of public services (including food and nutrition),
- the right to the city – implying the use and appropriation of spaces and services that are for public purpose (for example, regulations favoring the use of public spaces for markets).
Question 3 - About trends and information on key elements

- An improved account on the status and vulnerability to food insecurity today is needed.

Especially in relation to the most recent and consecutive global events (such as COVID-19, political conflicts and wars, and climate change events).

There are publications about food insecurity worsening during the pandemic and about the fact we do not have a real scenario of recovery yet, given other conditions also increasing vulnerability.

It is important to make this situation clearer for decision makers to realize this scenario is particularly sensitive to any policies or interventions they undertake - regarding or disregarding effects on food systems.

On markets:

- Some distinctions regarding markets should be made.

It seems the section on territorial markets (pp.46-47) is bringing together:

farmers markets, also referred as territorial markets in some studies;

retail markets, also referred as public markets, centrally located in cities or city districts, traditionally public properties but not the main status today;

and other forms of collective vending that may be identified as markets.

Informality and management weaknesses are more closely linked to retail and street markets than to farmers’ markets - which in certain locations may be operating as well-constituted spaces and under clearer policies than other public markets (for example, old farmers markets in the Andes, for wholesale and retail).

- The share of urban population obtaining food from market sources is mentioned (p.43) but it brings together different types of market sources which makes it unclear.

It is a complicated figure to build globally. It could be more accurate to describe the situation per region and/or per representative set of countries/cities for which the figure could be more accurately measured.

Question 4 - About references

- FAO Investment Centre Food systems assessments:

These reports can be useful for identifying regional trends, as well as to identify the attention given to the urban dimension in food systems sustainability (often not adequately assessed).

You may have reviewed this series of reports (from which some of the experts here and I participated) but I raise them because I did not see them in the citations.

It is a long set and it may be more time effective to contact the leaders of this initiative - James Tefft and Patrick Herlant (or Beatrice Ngirabacu, to facilitate the communication).

I recently collaborated in the synthesis of a regional report for Latin America, based on these FAO assessments conducted for LAC and enriched by information from a complementary set of country case studies. Patrick Herlant and Jorge Albarracin (Bolivia) were leading this effort. It may be a good source of information or complement to your reflections for this regional area.

- FAO – EBRD studies on urban food systems during COVID 19:

A team at the Investment Centre, led by Florent Tomatis, has undertaken a series of studies on urban food distribution in main European cities, funded by the EBRD. The publications were under review, but you could request more information (a tentative title to the complete publication was: COVID-19 Pandemic package: evolution of food distribution systems – The resilience pathway).

These case studies included values on the market share of different types of marketing channels, trends in food commercialization and consumption, among others.

- FAO Latin America reports on markets:

This regional office has developed some studies on the regional situation of markets, and included some approximations to the share of different marketing channels - where the traditional predominates.

There is also mention to trends. E-commerce for instance does not develop at the pace it does for northern countries.


- FAO Investment Centre on wholesale food markets:
Although the publication of the report we presented to you is still in process, we use references to public ‘virtual’ spaces where we have shared this work. A suggestion to include them in case what we shared was useful:

*Banco Interamericano de Desarrollo. 2022. Webinar: Mercados de alimentos: sistema alimentario urbano para ciudades resilientes.*

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=t_lj_pl7Sk&list=LL&index=10&t=2637s](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=t_lj_pl7Sk&list=LL&index=10&t=2637s)


[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aLHTjOFE-zw](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aLHTjOFE-zw)

*Huaita-Alfaro, A.M., Quintero, M.C., y Tomatis, F. 2023. Urban Food Security: How to connect our cities’ food systems?*


*Tomatis, F., Huaita-Alfaro, A.M. y Quintero, M.C. 2023. Urban Food Security: where should wholesale markets be located?*


- Studies on food markets – political economy and urban sociology approximations:

Sergio Schneider (University of Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil) and colleagues have developed some studies on food markets – mainly farmers markets, developing connections of these to larger food economic markets. You may find some inputs from their analysis of relevance here too:


*van der Ploeg, J.D., Ye, J. y Schneider, S. 2022. Reading markets politically: on the transformativity and relevance of peasant markets, The Journal of Peasant Studies, 1-26*

41. Dirce Marchioni, Instituto Nacional de Ciencia e Tecnologia Combate a Fome, Brazil

Dear moderator

We considered the time of our country to send the contributions, but it was closed when I tried.

I am sending our contribution below on behalf of the National Institute of Science and Technology Fight against Hunger, Brazil.

Best wishes

Dirce Marchioni

1. The V0 draft introduces a conceptual framework informed by key principles established in previous HLPE-FSN reports (HLPE, 2017; HLPE, 2020).

Do you find the proposed framework effective to highlight and discuss the key issues concerning urban and peri-urban food systems?

Yes

Is this a useful conceptual framework to provide practical guidance for policymakers?

Yes. However, when you give the figure (p10), there is a oversimplification in the aspects linked with each one of the dimensions.

Can you offer suggestions for examples to illustrate and facilitate the operationalization of the conceptual framework to address issues relevant for FSN?

We suggest to stress that it is a system, and not a linear e compartmentalized situation.

2. The report adopts the broader definition of food security (proposed by the HLPE-FSN in 2020), which includes six dimensions of food security: availability, access, utilization, stability, agency and sustainability.

Does the V0 draft cover sufficiently the implications of this broader definition in urban and peri-urban food systems?

The dimension of agency still is not very well explained. Since that, together with sustainability these are new additions to the framework, they should be more clear

3. Are the trends/variables/elements identified in the draft report the key ones to strengthen urban and peri-urban food systems? If not, which other elements should be considered?
Yes

Are there any other issues concerning urban and peri-urban food systems that have not been sufficiently covered in the draft report?

No

4. Is there additional quantitative or qualitative data that should be included?

Are there other references, publications, or traditional or different kind of knowledges, which should be considered?

5. Are there any redundant facts or statements that could be eliminated from the V0 draft?

No

6. Could you suggest case studies and success stories from countries that were able to strengthen urban and peri-urban food systems? In particular, the HLPE-FSN would seek contributions on:

No comments

a) evidence-based examples of successful interventions in urban and peri-urban food systems with the principles behind what made the process work;

b) efforts made to enhance agency in urban and peri-urban food systems;

c) efforts made to enhance the right to food in urban and peri-urban settings;

d) examples of circular economy and urban and peri-urban food system and climate change adaptation and mitigation, preferably beyond issues of production; and

e) examples of national and local government collaboration on urban and peri-urban food systems.
42. Dhanbahadur Magar, krishi journal, Nepal

Dear madam/Sir

I hope first of all I am congratulate to the (FSN) Coordinator body, I am engaging long time in agriculture's media sector, how I can contribution my role in agriculture sectors. I came from yet still Agriculture family background. Strengthening urban and peri-urban food systems to achieve food security and nutrition in the context of urbanization and rural transformation-V0 draft of the HLPE-FSN report #19

I recognize the about the agriculture value how is important for men. I wish in terms of play role in agriculture sector from my side.

Many many thanks FSN Coordinator body All of world FSN Members.

Giving me opportunity space of consultation Our dignified institution from the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO).

With best regards,

Dhanbahadur Magar

Online portal: www.krishijournal.com.np

See the attachments:

• Dhanbahadur Magar_Nepal case

43. Mauricio Hernández-F, Universidad Iberoamericana, Mexico

HLPE-FSN:

I begin by congratulating all co-authors, as integrating this wealth of information is no small feat. I am confident that this report will mark a watershed in the transformation of food systems.

I offer some suggestions for your consideration:

Section 6.5.4: It may be beneficial to discuss how public food procurement systems can serve as a market price benchmark, thereby helping to mitigate speculation in crisis contexts, akin to what was observed during the pandemic. Additionally, these systems could act as a distribution channel for food assistance programs aimed at the most vulnerable populations.
Section 1.4: It is imperative to acknowledge that the food system cannot be fully understood without considering its interplay with other major systems (referred to in the draft as urbanization), but a more detailed specification is needed to clarify the point. Relevant systems to mention include transportation, land ownership, water rights for agricultural production, housing, water supply and sanitation, education, and healthcare. This concept aligns with Aromar Revi’s notion of a “system of systems,” where social, economic, and biophysical dimensions converge.

Chapter 2: In discussions on demographics, it is essential to delve deeper into migration as both a cause and consequence of food insecurity. Furthermore, the language used should convey a greater sense of urgency regarding the climate crisis.

Section 3.3: National-level, representative data is required to understand Food Away From Home (FAFH) in many countries. The systematic reviews already identified primarily include high-income countries. An alternative source of data could be national income and expenditure surveys, though they often lack information on this aspect, as is the case in Mexico. Issuing a recommendation to low- and middle-income countries in this regard could be significant. Additionally, I suggest moving away from the binary developed vs. developing country terminology when referring to nations, as it is a limited perspective that we must transcend, especially when the discussion pertains solely to economic development. As an alternative, consider adopting the World Bank’s income-based classification: high-income countries, upper-middle-income countries, lower-middle-income countries, and low-income countries.

Regarding the retail section: It is important to note that convenience stores, which have formed large chains, are unequivocally part of the modern system. The relatively small size of each of their economic units belies the sophisticated logistics and distribution system behind them, hence their ability to displace traditional retail. On convenience stores, it would be beneficial to report their absolute and relative growth estimates in Mexico, referencing more recent and impactful publications (e.g., Hernández-F, M., Figueroa, J. L., & Colchero, M. A.. Association between density of stores and purchases of ultra-processed food and sugar-sweetened beverages in Mexico. Health & Place 2021, 68, 102528).

Complexity aspects: To go beyond the HLPE 2017’s modern/traditional/mixed system classification, consider including complexity aspects. For instance, various companies have organized retail schemes based on the informal labor market, as observed in Mexico.
44. Natalie Wright, New York City Mayor's Office of Food Policy, United States of America

Dear Svetlana Livinets,

I am reaching out today on behalf of the New York City Mayor’s Office of Food Policy.

Our team has thoroughly reviewed the V0 draft of the HLPE-FSN Report #19 and compiled our feedback into a comprehensive document.

To ensure our insights are considered, I have attached the feedback document. We sincerely hope that you can incorporate our valuable input into the ongoing consultation process.

Our office has invested significant effort in providing insightful and constructive feedback, and it would be regrettable if our contributions were not taken into consideration. We appreciate your understanding of the urgency of this matter and your prompt attention to our submission.

Thank you for your cooperation, and we look forward to the successful completion of the HLPE-FSN Report #19.

If there is anything additional I can do to facilitate the consideration of our submission, please do not hesitate to reach out.

Thank you

Natalie Wright

Intern,

Mayor’s Office of Food Policy

Comments

1. The V0 draft introduces a conceptual framework informed by key principles established in previous HLPE-FSN reports (HLPE, 2017; HLPE, 2020). Do you find the proposed framework effective to highlight and discuss the key issues concerning urban and peri-urban food systems? Is this a useful conceptual framework to provide practical guidance for policymakers? Can you offer suggestions for examples to illustrate and facilitate the operationalization of the conceptual framework to address issues relevant for FSN?

The proposed conceptual framework adeptly organizes the intricate issues within urban and peri-urban food systems. While it provides valuable insights into these key matters, its high-level guidance might pose challenges for policymakers in day-to-day practicality, especially during localization efforts. This limitation stems from the diverse and evolving contexts in which interventions are implemented.
2. The report adopts the broader definition of food security (proposed by the HLPE-FSN in 2020), which includes six dimensions of food security: availability, access, utilization, stability, agency and sustainability. Does the V0 draft cover sufficiently the implications of this broader definition in urban and peri-urban food systems?

While the six dimensions offer a robust foundation, these additional considerations of social and cultural implications as well as inclusivity. Inclusion of said factors could enhance the framework's applicability to the complexities of urban and peri-urban food systems. The V0 draft touches on participatory approaches and engagement with civil society. However, a more explicit focus on the social and cultural dimensions of food security, including community preferences and cultural practices related to food, could be beneficial. Moreover, additional social and cultural values such as faith hold a space in food security consideration. Similarly, the V0 draft provides examples of interventions but may benefit from emphasizing inclusivity, ensuring that all segments of the population, especially vulnerable groups, have equitable access to food and participate in decision-making processes.

3. Are the trends/variables/elements identified in the draft report the key ones to strengthen urban and peri-urban food systems? If not, which other elements should be considered? Are there any other issues concerning urban and peri-urban food systems that have not been sufficiently covered in the draft report? Are topics under- or over-represented in relation to their importance?

In chapter 3.4, “Urban food choices and food environments,” consider adding health and chronic disease treatment and prevention. Aligning food security and nutrition with public health concerns can create multi-sectoral efforts within food systems. Similarly, in chapter 4.6, “Cross-cutting issues,” consider including children, particularly the role of schools in combating food insecurity and enhancing nutrition education.

4. Is there additional quantitative or qualitative data that should be included? Are there other references, publications, or traditional or different kind of knowledges, which should be considered?

Recognizing the significance of indigenous knowledge is an important consideration in fortifying urban and peri-urban food systems to attain food security and nutrition amidst the challenges of urbanization and rural transformation. Indigenous knowledge encompasses sustainable agricultural practices that foster biodiversity and climate resilience, offering valuable insights. This indigenous wisdom contributes to the fortification of resilient food systems by endorsing the cultivation of diverse crops and plants, thus diminishing reliance on a limited set of staple foods. These practices are often intricately adapted to local ecosystems and weather conditions. The incorporation of traditional knowledge into urban and peri-urban agriculture has the potential to augment resilience in the face of climate change, assisting communities in adapting to unpredictable weather patterns.

As for additional publications, the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs publishes an academic journal named the Natural Resource Forum, which synthesizes research from across the globe, contextualizing it within the framework of sustainable development goals. Tapping into the expertise presented in this peer-reviewed journal, especially articles addressing food security, may be immensely valuable.

5. Are there any redundant facts or statements that could be eliminated from the V0 draft?
While redundancy may not be evident in the draft, there is an opportunity to enhance the historical context for greater clarity. A more concise writing style, coupled with a review of the depth of historical information, could improve overall quality. Additionally, incorporating a summary of key points at the outset of each chapter would contribute to a more streamlined presentation.

6. Could you suggest case studies and success stories from countries that were able to strengthen urban and peri-urban food systems? In particular, the HLPE-FSN would seek contributions on: a) evidence-based examples of successful interventions in urban and peri-urban food systems with the principles behind what made the process work; b) efforts made to enhance agency in urban and peri-urban food systems; c) efforts made to enhance the right to food in urban and peri-urban settings; d) examples of circular economy and urban and peri-urban food system and climate change adaptation and mitigation, preferably beyond issues of production; and e) examples of national and local government collaboration on urban and peri-urban food systems.

a) Evidence-Based Examples of Successful Interventions:

The NYC Greenmarkets promotes regional agriculture by providing a retail outlet for small family farms, ensuring the availability of fresh, locally-produced food in the city. Additionally, the Farm to School Programs connect efforts between local farms and NYC schools to incorporate locally sourced and fresh produce into school meals.

b) Efforts to Enhance Agency:

NYC supports community gardens and urban farms, empowering residents to actively participate in food production, fostering a sense of agency and ownership. Additionally, the recently released Food Education Roadmap reflects the City's commitment to bolstering food literacy and nutrition education. Sixty schools were each awarded $11,000 in grant money to support the expansion of nutrition education.

c) Efforts to Enhance the Right to Food:

Various city-wide programs work to ensure that vulnerable populations have access to nutritious food during times of need, promoting the right to food. In 2022, 854,000 Health bucks, worth over $1.7 million, were distributed as a SNAP incentive. The supply gap decreased in 114 neighborhoods from 2021 to 2022. Over 1 million New Yorkers live within a half mile of a FRESH market. Additionally, $4.9 million in grants were distributed to improve access to all benefits enrollment, and there were 2,228 Groceries to Go participants.

d) Circular Economy and Climate Change Adaptation:

The NYC Compost Project focuses on composting organic waste, contributing to a circular economy, reducing landfill waste, and addressing climate change through sustainable waste management. The city manages 230,000 acres in forest management plans, allocating $150M to preserve farms and forests from development through the Watershed Agricultural Council.

e) National and Local Government Collaboration:
The NYC Mayor’s Office of Food Policy collaborates with various city agencies, local organizations, and communities to develop and implement comprehensive food policies that address urban food challenges. Notable achievements include NYC being the first U.S. city to join the Cool Food Pledge, launching the NYC Plant-Powered Carbon Challenge to reduce private sector food emissions by 25% by 2030, winning the Milan Pact Award in 2022 for the Good Food Purchasing Framework, and presenting at the C40 Food Network Webinar in 2023 about the city’s work on food in hospitals. In 2018, New York City became the first city in the world to directly report to the United Nations on local progress toward the Sustainable Development Goals and was the first entity to present at the NYS Food as Medicine Coalition.

45. Brandon Eisler, Nutritional Diversity, Panama

Strengthening urban and peri-urban food systems to achieve food security and nutrition in the context of urbanization and rural transformation involves several key strategies: PART 1

1. **Promote Urban Agriculture**: Encourage city dwellers to engage in farming activities. This can include community gardens, rooftop gardens, and vertical farming. These practices not only provide fresh produce but also help in greening urban areas.

2. **Develop Local Food Networks**: Build connections between urban consumers and rural producers. This can include farmers’ markets and community-supported agriculture programs, which ensure a steady market for farmers and access to fresh food for urban residents.

3. **Enhance Supply Chain Efficiency**: Improve transportation and storage facilities to minimize food loss and ensure that fresh produce reaches urban markets quickly and in good condition.

4. **Educational Programs**: Implement educational initiatives to teach urban residents about nutrition, food preparation, and the benefits of locally sourced food. [This is a high quality online education program coming up that could totally foster advancement in urban communities to include household cultivation and incentives for such, and community for such a] [This is our Nutritional Diversity educational platform that we have worked to develop however reaching mass exposure has been rough! b]

5. **Policy Support and Investment**: Governments and local authorities need to support urban agriculture through policies, funding, and research. This includes zoning for urban farming and providing financial incentives.

6. **Incorporate Technology**: Use modern technologies like hydroponics and aquaponics in urban farming, which are efficient in space and resource usage.
7. Food Waste Management: Implement strategies for reducing food waste and recycling organic waste into compost for urban agriculture. Community compost is where all of this starts.

By integrating these approaches, urban and peri-urban food systems can be strengthened to better address the challenges of food security and nutrition in rapidly urbanizing and transforming societies.

The most effective way will be education on a better diet, the Nutritional Diversity diet specifically will create the demand for better food systems in the city, and this demand will fuel the change.

46. Bibi Ally, Private Sector Mechanism of UN Committee on Food Security, United States of America

Dear Co Facilitators, please see the Private Sector Mechanism Comments on the VO Draft Report

Introduction

PSM thanks the HLPE-FSN for the VO draft Report on strengthening urban and peri-urban food systems to achieve food security and nutrition in the context of urbanization and rural transformation and for the opportunity to share its views on the draft.

Guiding Questions

1. The V0 draft introduces a conceptual framework informed by key principles established in previous HLPE-FSN reports (HLPE, 2017; HLPE, 2020).

   i. Do you find the proposed framework effective to highlight and discuss the key issues concerning urban and peri-urban food systems?

   ii. Is this a useful conceptual framework to provide practical guidance for policymakers?

   iii. Can you offer suggestions for examples to illustrate and facilitate the operationalization of the conceptual framework to address issues relevant for FSN?

Response:

The report effectively highlights the profound impact of urbanization on food security and nutrition, emphasizing the increasing urban population, especially in developing countries. This comprehensive approach provides a valuable foundation for understanding the challenges and opportunities in urban and peri-urban food systems. It is a long overdue discussion and assessment of how urban and peri-urban agriculture can significantly contribute to food and nutrition security and will help to
demonstrate how we accomplish multiple SDG's through these innovative collaborations. It is a useful conceptual framework for policy makers new to the subject and issue areas, however there should be greater emphasis in the language and descriptive overview of the opportunities and threats. Focusing on examples of already successful agricultural collaborations taking place across the urban and peri-urban landscapes will help readers visualize the impacts of edible landscapes at all scales and dimensions.

Some additional areas to be covered are:

a) Demographic Shift and Pressures on Food Systems

The report should explicitly address the impact of growing youth migration to urban areas, recognizing it as a pivotal demographic shift. Comprehensive coverage of the issue should encompass the implications of this migration on urban and peri-urban food systems, emphasizing the need for strategies to meet the heightened demand for food in urban areas in the context of limited urban agricultural land. Moreover, heightened demand in urban areas also results in a reduced ability in rural areas to meet such increases.

b) Inequalities and Vulnerabilities in Urban Food Systems

While the report rightly emphasizes inequalities between physical access in urban food systems, additional attention should be given to the vulnerabilities exacerbated by lack of transportation, basic service access, inadequate housing, and land disparities, especially in urban slums and peripheral areas. The report should provide insights into how these factors contribute to the fragility of urban food systems, particularly in disruptions such as the COVID-19 pandemic.

c) Resilience to Climate Change and Sustainable Practices

The report should delve deeper into strategies required for urban and peri-urban food systems to build resilience to climate change impacts. This includes a comprehensive exploration of sustainable urban agriculture practices, with specific recommendations for initiatives such as providing land access, composting facilities, education to residents for local food production and access to renewable low-cost energy. Further, the report should address how urban agriculture can support biodiversity as an important aspect of climate resilience.

d. Circular Economy Principles and Collaborative Initiatives

Policymakers should be urged to advocate for resource efficiency through integrated solutions that reduce waste and energy consumption. As per the FAO Framework for the Urban Food Agenda, optimized supply chains and circular bioeconomy contribute to a reduction of food losses and waste in urban centers. The report should provide concrete examples of circular economy principles within urban and peri-urban food systems and recommendations for fostering collaboration among diverse stakeholders.
e. Water Management and Waste Reduction Strategies

A more detailed examination of strategies balancing urban water needs with agriculture is essential. The report should include specific recommendations for efficient water management in urban and peri-urban areas. Furthermore, a comprehensive exploration of food waste reduction strategies, recycling, and resource reuse should be provided to address both environmental and economic concerns.

f) Governance, Policies, and the Food-Energy-Water Nexus Approach

The report should emphasize the significance of effective governance, regulations, and policies in addressing urban and peri-urban food system challenges. A specific recommendation is to elaborate on the practical implementation of the “Food-Energy-Water Nexus” approach, providing policymakers with actionable insights to make informed decisions.

g) Incentives, Monitoring, and Data Collection

Policymakers must play a proactive role in fostering collaboration and incentivizing sustainable practices. The report should provide specific recommendations for policymakers, such as strategically locating urban food hubs to reduce transportation energy consumption, promoting water-efficient farming practices, and providing financial incentives or grants for businesses and individuals adopting sustainable practices. Robust data collection and monitoring systems should be emphasized for evidence-based policy decisions.

2. The report adopts the broader definition of food security (proposed by the HLPE-FSN in 2020), which includes six dimensions of food security: availability, access, utilization, stability, agency and sustainability.

i. Does the V0 draft cover sufficiently the implications of this broader definition in urban and peri-urban food systems?

Response:

The report provides an in-depth exploration of urban and peri-urban food security and nutrition and contributes to the understanding of urban and peri-urban food systems by offering a comprehensive definition. The broader definition of urban and peri-urban food systems acknowledges the intricate factors influencing food production, distribution, and consumption in urban areas, this expanded perspective brings several implications by encompassing physical aspects like agriculture and logistics and considering social, economic, and environmental dimensions. It underscores the need for holistic and interdisciplinary approaches to address the challenges of urban food systems, emphasizing the importance of stakeholder collaboration, data-driven decision-making, and adaptive governance. Moreover, it recognizes the potential for innovation and the development of resilient, sustainable, and
inclusive urban food systems that can improve food security, reduce environmental impacts, and enhance the overall well-being of urban populations.

However, the report’s definition needs to refer to farmers who actually produce the food whether on a roof top, a vacant lot or inside a re-configured sea container.

3. Are the trends/variables/elements identified in the draft report the key ones to strengthen urban and peri-urban food systems? If not, which other elements should be considered?

i. Are there any other issues concerning urban and peri-urban food systems that have not been sufficiently covered in the draft report?

ii. Are topics under- or over-represented in relation to their importance?

Response:

There are excellent and far ranging parts of the draft report which cover many of the difficulties of producing, processing and selling food in an urban environment. These go a long way towards exposing some of the weaknesses and chronic problems inherent in city after city. It is good to note that the report demonstrates that there can be no one size fits all system for these transformational suggestions. The experience of the COVID19 pandemic and the multistakeholder collaboration which ensued to get food to those in need, can be used to illustrate some of what is going right with urban and peri-urban agriculture and rural agriculture and our food system and where there are vulnerabilities and significant areas of improvement for greater resilience. Showcase examples of industry adaptation and innovation under crisis.

The need for critical infrastructure for growing crops and livestock was not well covered. Water, soil, energy, cooling, cold storage, transportation pest control, and skilled labor, these are vital for perishable fruit and vegetable production at any scale.

Additionally, there is a limited discussion on urban governance power. The report acknowledges the paradox of cities having significant impact on food systems while simultaneously holding limited direct power over them. Expanding on this aspect, including specific examples or case studies, could provide more practical insights into how urban governance can effectively influence food systems despite these limitations.

While the report addresses the positive impacts of urbanization, it tends to generalize these benefits. A more nuanced discussion acknowledging the variable impacts of urbanization across different regions and contexts, especially the disparities between developed and developing countries, would provide a more balanced perspective.

Considering the increasing impact of climate change on food security and agriculture, the report could place greater emphasis on how urban and peri-urban food systems are affected by and can adapt to climate change. This includes discussing strategies for resilience in the face of extreme weather events,
changes in crop yields, and shifts in agricultural zones, which are crucial for future-proofing urban food systems.

While urban and peri-urban food systems have the potential to provide local communities with access to local food production and strengthens local economies by supporting family farmers and other local businesses, one of the biggest challenges is space and land use for production. In this regard, it is important that the HLPE report address the need for creative use of public spaces. This can include the acceleration of the safe conversion of land use from non-agricultural to agricultural purposes, for example by making the land use histories of urban spaces publicly available and making soil testing resources more easily accessible. Additionally, there should be clear legal frameworks for the use and transfer of vacant lots and public land for agriculture and investments in the unique needs of urban agriculture, including sustained soil remediation and improvement processes.

On the issue of taxation, taxing or subsidizing a single food or ingredients may not lead to an improvement in diets, since people can increase consumption of other similarly less nutritious items. It is important to fill the research gap on the impact of taxes and subsidies. All policies should be research and evidence-based. Food choices are generally not very sensitive to price changes, and food choices have many available substitutes which are not controlled for dietary impact (e.g., consumers may avoid a high-sodium packaged food because of a tax but choose to eat high-sodium food from a street vendor, with no impact on improving health).

The FAO Framework for the Urban Food Agenda demonstrates how the framework’s guiding principles; rural-urban synergies, social inclusion and equity, resilience and sustainability, food systems interconnections, contribute to all 17 SDGs. The linkages between the SDGs and urban and peri urban food systems should be more clearly articulated.

4. Is there additional quantitative or qualitative data that should be included?

i. Are there other references, publications, or traditional or different kind of knowledges, which should be considered?

Response:

Strengthening urban and peri-urban food systems to achieve food security and nutrition in the context of urbanization and rural transformation requires a comprehensive and multidimensional approach. One key element for inclusion is how to empower local communities to participate in food production and decision-making. Support community-based organizations, cooperatives, and urban farming initiatives.

The good recommendations in the report speak to the need for an accessible catalog of all the best practices and innovative collaborations taking place around the world.

5. Are there any redundant facts or statements that could be eliminated from the V0 draft?
6. Could you suggest case studies and success stories from countries that were able to strengthen urban and peri-urban food systems? In particular, the HLPE-FSN would seek contributions on:

a) evidence-based examples of successful interventions in urban and peri-urban food systems with the principles behind what made the process work;

b) efforts made to enhance agency in urban and peri-urban food systems;

c) efforts made to enhance the right to food in urban and peri-urban settings;

d) examples of circular economy and urban and peri-urban food system and climate change adaptation and mitigation, preferably beyond issues of production; and

e) examples of national and local government collaboration on urban and peri-urban food systems.

Response:

Farm to Family Food Box projects; Farm to Food Bank projects; Edible Landscape projects at all schools and universities; Farm Academies for newly arrived immigrants with agricultural background; Veterans to Farmers projects; Youth Farm projects from FFA to 4-H and international equivalents.

Multiple agency collaboration and budget contributions that achieve multiple benefits from environment, health, hands-on education, cultural sharing and training; waste to energy; climate resilience.

Getting food from the farm to the table and all the support and infrastructure needed to accomplish that day after day is a challenge and the report should address how to build resilience in the form of infrastructure from food safety to invasive pests/species protocols.

Looking at new interventions and innovations from the top down and from the bottom up that can receive funding streams from unusual partners and collaborators and cross agency investment in annual budgets could be examined as ways to address these challenges.

There are several case studies and success stories from countries around the world that have successfully strengthened their urban and peri-urban food systems. These examples showcase various approaches and strategies that can serve as inspiration for other regions facing similar challenges. Here are a few notable ones:

- **Singapore’s Vertical Farming**: with limited land available for agriculture, Singapore has invested in vertical farming and high-tech urban agriculture.
- **Milan, Italy’s Food Policy**: Milan implemented a comprehensive Food Policy in 2015 that focuses on sustainable food systems, urban agriculture, and reducing food waste. The policy
includes initiatives like the "Milan Urban Food Policy Pact," which encourages cities worldwide to adopt sustainable food policies.

- **Copenhagen, Denmark's Food Sharing**: Copenhagen has embraced food sharing initiatives, where surplus food from restaurants, supermarkets, and wholesalers is redistributed to those in need.

- **Portland, Oregon's Urban Green Spaces**: Portland has prioritized the creation of urban green spaces, including community gardens and urban farms. These spaces provide opportunities for local residents to grow their own food, fostering a sense of community and promoting sustainable food production within the city.

- **Kigali, Rwanda's Urban Agriculture**: Kigali has promoted urban agriculture as a means of improving food security and reducing urban poverty. Initiatives like "Hinga Weze" support small-scale urban farmers, providing training, resources, and market access.

- **New York City's Green Carts**: New York City launched the "Green Carts" program, which encourages the sale of fresh fruits and vegetables in underserved neighborhoods. Street vendors receive licenses to sell healthy produce, increasing access to nutritious food options in urban areas.

- **Toronto, Canada's Local Food Procurement**: Toronto has implemented policies to support local food procurement for public institutions, such as schools and hospitals. This has boosted demand for local agricultural products and strengthened the regional food system.

- **Mumbai, India's Urban Farming**: rooftop and balcony farming initiatives have gained traction.

- **Circular Agriculture in Rotterdam**: Rotterdam embraces circular agriculture practices, such as using food waste for urban farming and employing aquaponics. This not only reduces waste but also enhances climate resilience through sustainable practices.

---

**47. Pat Mc Mahon, Mothers First, Ireland**

**Background to this submission**

Mothers First Contributed to the VO draft of the Inequalities work stream. In that work stream we unsuccessfully advocated for the inclusion of acute food insecurity which is extreme food insecurity and its associated nutritional outcomes in the final Inequalities Report. A link to our submission on this platform can be found here [https://www.fao.org/fsnforum/comment/11101](https://www.fao.org/fsnforum/comment/11101)

Given that the mandate of the CFS and MyPOW is to reach the most food insecure and malnourished people we sought to understand why the inequalities report failed to achieve this central mandate.

Our findings are stark and show that the expertise and narrative of the CFS and the HLPE have traditionally centred around chronic hunger with its strong ties to the SOFI Report. This has created a blind spot within the CFS framework of achieving its vision to reach the most food-insecure and malnourished people in our world.
Our policy input paper for the Open-Ended Working Group on the Policy Convergence Process for the Inequalities Report details that under the framework of SOFI, the CFS cannot fulfil its mandate of reaching the most food-insecure and malnourished people.

That input paper along with our recommendations can be found here.


Relevance of our findings to the peri-urban VO draft

Just as within the VO draft and the final Inequalities Report, this report focuses on chronic hunger and its associated nutritional outcome of stunting and being overweight. Our analysis of this report provides further evidence that the CFS framework cannot achieve its mandate of reaching the most severe food insecure and malnourished.

The attached report will focus on our analysis of the VO Draft using a keyword search of the document. We then provide an analysis of gaps beyond acute food insecurity that we feel are relevant and would be beneficial to the report.

This input paper will build on the previous submissions by taking a more in-depth look at the nutritional outcomes associated with acute malnutrition in women, adolescent girls and children. While it is generally accepted that acute malnutrition in children represented by child wasting is 30% lower for urban than rural, nonetheless as the report points out in its only reference to wasting stands at 8% which is considered a public health concern.

We will also explore the prevalence of maternal underweight and its impacts on maternal and child nutritional outcomes. Again while the prevalence of maternal malnutrition is lower in urban than rural it remains a significant challenge with a prevalence of 15%.

Note to the HLPE CC members and the writing teams

While we unreservedly acknowledge the wealth of experience and, in many cases a lifelong commitment to alleviating hunger and malnutrition. The writing team are experts in chronic hunger, be it through fisheries, agriculture, science, economics and innovation. In this regard as a report based on the writing team’s background, this is an excellent first draft.

The gaps we have identified however centre around acute food insecurity and their nutritional outcomes which currently affects over 340 million people, equating to almost 1 in 3 people who are hungry in our world today.

Kind Regards,

Pat Mc Mahon, Mothers First
See the attachments:

- Acute food insecurity in the peri urban setting

**48. Juliana Tangari, Comida do Amanha Institute, Brazil**

Congratulations for this report. Beautiful and very useful work. It provides a broad approach to food security, taking into account all its 6 dimensions, although I believe the sustainability aspect didn't get a deeper attention. Moreover I'd like to mention a couple of experiences and examples from Brazil:

- the program LUPPA, mentioned in 5.4.2, is a civil-society led project oriented not only to be a supportive network for municipalities in Brazil but also a platform to spotlight food policy innovation (as highlighted in 5.4.3) and a enabler of food policy strategies (5.4.1). For that, within the program we've been able to observe and study several governance structures and test their usefulness, like the municipal transversal agencies for food policymaking and monitoring - Interdepartamental Chamber for Food and Nutrition Security, aka CAISAN, in its Portuguese acronym - a widespread policymaking structure in Brazil, by which several municipal offices or departments come together to plan a (ideally) coherent municipal food strategy. In LUPPA we support cities to enable their CAISANs because they represent an important institutional enabler, as mentioned in 6.4.1.

Another widespread structure present in Brazilian cities is the food policy council, usually called in Brazil by the name of Food and Nutrition Security Council (or CONSEA, in its Portuguese acronym). These councils are enabled at all federation levels (municipal, state and national) and are very important to keep the dialogue between public authorities and civil society / stakeholders. Food policy councils in Brazilian cities act not only at policy monitoring but also in policymaking - usually they provide guidelines for the food strategy and /or to enable food-related policies, like those related to communal kitchens, urban agriculture, and food banks.

Regarding the multi-level policy coherence enabler (6.4.3) I'd like to raise awareness to the Brazilian "SISAN" - the national System for Food and Nutrition Security. SISAN was created in 2006, and besides the federal hiatus of 2019-2022, it has been evolved to, among other goals, support the dialogue and technical support among government levels for better food policymaking.

In 5.3.1 and 6.4.6, the report highlights the importance of human resource capacities and for that I want to call attention to a case study with Brazilian cities led by EMBRAPA in partnership with LUPPA ("Food and Cities", 2023, attached) in which we found that well trained and supported teams were considered the first enabler of good local food policies.

In 6.4.6 I suggest more attention should be given to the importance of local food systems diagnostics and planning and how municipal authorities and civil society organizations need technical support to better
understand local food system bottlenecks, opportunities of change, negotiation techniques, understanding trade-offs, good practices of policy planning, including budget allocation.

Examples of food policy innovation (5.4.1) can also be seen in Brazil, like the "Mesa Solidária" program of Curitiba (a innovative partnership to provide free meals to vulnerable people) and the "Mumbuca" program of Maricá (a kind of social currency that is used within municipal boundaries to transfer income to vulnerable people, who then can use such currency at local restaurants and other public facilities) - all examples of food policy innovation are presented in LUPPA Journals 2nd edition - attached (luppa.comidoamanha.org).

Finally, regarding partnerships, highlighted in 5.3.2, I call attention to the work of a quasi-public agency for social services in Brazil - "SESC", that currently leads one of the main food bank programs in Brazil - the "Mesa Brasil" program, partnering with several cities nationwide to fight food waste and food insecurity.

Considering the recommendations and typology of policy instruments found in chapter 6, I believe there could be room to mention the importance of technical assistance, and all sorts of capacity support through local programs to support urban and peri-urban farmers and other urban food actors that need technical support to better thrive (food procurement alone, without some sort of technical assistance / knowledge support can be useless). In general, I think these final recommendations (6.5) are missing or giving less attention to the sustainability dimension of food security.

See the attachments:

- Food and Cities - case study from Brazil - 2023

49. Ernie Shea, Solutions from the Land, United States of America

Solutions from the Land[1] (SfL) Farmer Leaders' Perspectives and Recommendations on V0 draft of the Committee on World Food Security (CFS) High Level Panel of Experts (HLPE) report on urban and peri-urban food systems

Topic: Strengthening urban and peri-urban food systems to achieve food security and nutrition in the context of urbanization and rural transformation – V0 draft of the HLPE-FSN report #19

Submitted by A.G. Kawamura on behalf of SfL. A.G. is a produce/specialty crop grower and shipper; Former Secretary, California Department of Food and Agriculture; Founding Partner, Orange County Produce, LLC; Indian Wells, CA.
1. The V0 draft introduces a conceptual framework informed by key principles established in previous HLPE-FSN reports (HLPE, 2017; HLPE, 2020). Do you find the proposed framework effective to highlight and discuss the key issues concerning urban and peri-urban food systems?

Yes, the long overdue discussion and assessment of how urban and peri-urban agriculture can significantly contribute to food and nutrition insecurity will help open the global imagination on how we accomplish multiple SDGs through these innovative collaborations.

Is this a useful conceptual framework to provide practical guidance for policymakers?

It is a useful conceptual framework for policy makers new to the subject and issue areas, however it falls short in diluting the actual role for agriculture and for farmers by reducing their inclusion in most of the language and descriptive overview of the opportunities and threats.

Can you offer suggestions for examples to illustrate and facilitate the operationalization of the conceptual framework to address issues relevant for FSN?

Focusing on true proof of concept examples of already successful agricultural collaborations taking place across the urban and peri-urban landscapes helps people fully visualize the impacts of edible landscapes at all scales and dimensions.

2. The report adopts the broader definition of food security (proposed by the HLPE-FSN in 2020), which includes six dimensions of food security: availability, access, utilization, stability, agency and sustainability. Does the V0 draft cover sufficiently the implications of this broader definition in urban and peri-urban food systems?

The broader definition provided by the “six dimensions” of food security seems to exclude the key aspect of any food system…who produces the food, how and with what resources? Pretending there are “actors” who are going to fill this role ignores the actual predicament of where are the real “farmers” who can actually grow out a crop whether on a roof top, a vacant lot or inside a re-configured sea container.

3. Are the trends/variables/elements identified in the draft report the key ones to strengthen urban and peri-urban food systems? If not, which other elements should be considered?

There are excellent and far-ranging parts of the draft report which cover many of the ‘bureaucratic’ difficulties of producing, processing, and selling food in an urban environment. These go a long way towards exposing some of the weaknesses and chronic problems inherent in city after city that has no sense of its food future...or an imagined ideal about what its food future might be. It is at least refreshing to note that the report is less prescriptive and seems to understand that there can be no one, best system for these transformational suggestions. And yet, the fact that the writers of the report are stuck with a negative framing of the food system as it exists is worrisome. The idea that fast food cannot be happy food. The complaint that processed food is poor for the health. The encouragement of food police. These types of exhortations that we need an urgent “radical transformation” of our global food system fails to acknowledge that we are already experiencing an urgent, radical transformation of our food
system in a remarkable span of time and that it has been going quite well, despite some mistakes and good intentions that have created foreseen and unforeseen problems (like food deserts) going forward. We can use the COVID pandemic to daylight so much of what is going right with urban and peri-urban agriculture (rural agriculture too) and our food system and where we have vulnerabilities and significant areas of improvement for greater resilience. Showcase examples of civil society and industry adaptation and innovation under crisis.

Are there any other issues concerning urban and peri-urban food systems that have not been sufficiently covered in the draft report?

The need for critical infrastructure for growing crops and livestock was not well covered. Water, soil, energy, cooling, cold storage, transportation pest control, and skilled labor. So many of these are vital for perishable fruit and vegetable production at any scale.

Are topics under- or over-represented in relation to their importance?

Some topics seem very over-represented, specifically the multiple references for funding support for more studies, more measurements, more ‘thinking’ about the problems that we have faced for centuries. What is under-represented is that that funding for non-productive activity could go a very long way to build out the capacity and talent to end food/nutrition insecurity. Why not focus on replication and scaling up of successful models creating greater and more immediate impact with available and new funding?

4. Is there additional quantitative or qualitative data that should be included?

What more do you need to know? That kids with a lousy diet are health risks...that kids that come to school hungry are not the best students...that babies that are nutrient deficient will suffer irreparable damage both cognitive and physical (stunting). How many more grants and dollars will be used for job security for an army of non-productive but very well-educated individuals?

Are there other references, publications, or traditional or different kind of knowledges, which should be considered?

The good recommendations in the report speak to the need for an accessible catalog of all the best practices and innovative collaborations taking place around the world.

5. Are there any redundant facts or statements that could be eliminated from the V0 draft?

If the goal is to create a guidebook/roadmap that might help accomplish multiple SDGs within the urban/peri-urban landscape...through an edible landscape re-thinking of the resource base that exists in cities, then there are quite a few redundant passages that seem more focused on what’s already obvious and what’s perceived to be wrong with the food system.
6. Could you suggest case studies and success stories from countries that were able to strengthen urban and peri-urban food systems? Yes…In particular, the HLPE-FSN would seek contributions on:

- evidence-based examples of successful interventions in urban and peri-urban food systems with the principles behind what made the process work;

Farm to Family Food Box projects; Farm to Food Bank projects; Edible Landscape projects at all schools and universities; Farm Academies for newly arrived immigrants with agricultural background; Veterans to Farmers projects; Youth Farm projects from FFA to 4-H and international equivalents.

- efforts made to enhance agency in urban and peri-urban food systems;

Multiple agency collaboration and budget contributions that achieve multiple benefits from environment, health, hands-on education, cultural sharing and training; waste to energy; climate resilience.

- efforts made to enhance the right to food in urban and peri-urban settings;

The right to food comes with an assumption that you have an abundance of food…or enough food for everyone. Yes, the challenge of calories versus nutrition is the expanding focal point of food system strategies…as we look to embrace concepts of food as medicine and the food/health nexus. The more daunting challenge is getting food from the farm to the table and all the support and infrastructure needed to accomplish that day after day. That's where this report seems to fall short in daylighting the reality that farming or gardening is not easy and quite unpredictable if we haven't built in more resilience in the form of infrastructure from food safety to invasive pests/species protocols.

- examples of circular economy and urban and peri-urban food system and climate change adaptation and mitigation, preferably beyond issues of production; and

Another area that is barely described or mentioned is the incredible opportunities to re-imagine the ‘urban forest’ and urban landscaping that mostly looks nice, is costly and creates tons of biomass and employment for an army of folks who might otherwise be farmers & farmhands.

- examples of national and local government collaboration on urban and peri-urban food systems.

Plenty of new interventions and innovations from the top down and hopefully from the bottom up that can receive funding streams from unusual partners and collaborators. Cross agency investment in annual budgets could ‘radically’ shift to create more (yes measurable) ‘bang for the buck’.

---

[i] The mission of Solutions from the Land, a farmer-led organization, is to inspire, mobilize and equip agricultural, forestry and fishery leaders to advance pragmatic, proven and innovative agricultural solutions that benefit producers, the public and the planet in a new era where sustainably managed farms, ranches, fisheries and forests are at the forefront of resolving food system, food and nutrition security, energy, environmental and climate challenges to concurrently achieve global sustainable development goals (SDGs).
50. Paule Moustier, Cirad, France

The report is dense and rich with analyses and recommendations. I found the policy perspective especially interesting (as developed in Chapter 6). Some suggestions to further improve the report are given below.

1. The institutional/policy focus may leave behind the questions related to infrastructures, i.e., physical market places and rural-urban transportation, which are constraining in terms of consumers’ regular access to local and safe food (especially fresh food items which are essential in terms of nutrition). Improvement in logistics is necessary to reduce food losses, and should be grounded by a characterisation of city foodsheds.

2. The characterisation of Urban and Peri-Urban food systems (Chapter 4) looks more like a list of items than as a classification and I would suggest to draw more on the typology we developed in Moustier et al. 2023, which considers the type of food items, the length of chain, the nature of relationships, the value orientation and the consumers' socio-economic profiles. I find that the use of the term « territorial markets » is little appropriate to the district-based retail markets which make the bulk of urban consumers’ food supply in Asian and Sub-Saharan African cities. Likewise, most wholesale markets in Asia and Africa are not territorial. In these regions of the world, most retail and wholesale markets are place-based but not territorial, as they distribute local as well as imported food items, and they are not necessarily supported by a place-based community of stakeholders, sharing common visions and objectives. Relative to supermarket or e-commerce distribution, retail and wholesale markets (which may be formal or informal) are characterised by regular interactions and some amount of trust between the vendors and their customers, this is why we prefer to term them as relational rather than as territorial. The term territorial markets may be more appropriate to qualify assembly and retail markets with strong links with neighbouring communities, including various types of farmers’ markets (which are accounted for in our typology in the « value-oriented, SME-based urban food systems »).

3. The report stresses on different occasions how diversity is essential for resilience. This is especially relevant. Diversity of food formats is also important to reduce food losses, as different formats have different requirements in terms of quality standards with consequences on food losses as demonstrated in the case of Colombia (Chaboud and Moustier, 2020).

4. About successful interventions on UFS, some examples of UFIL (Urban Food Innovation Lab) can be found in the Urbal book (Valette et al, 2024), in particular, the setting of a value-oriented SME-driven tortilla enterprise in Mexico (Leloup and Legall, 2024) [other technical innovations for small-scale food processing e.g. fish drying in Africa can be found in Pallet et al, 2020], direct farm-consumer chain for food based on digital technology in Hanoi (Bruckert et al, 2024), sustainable school catering programme in Montpellier (Perignon et al, 2024). On the whole I think that there should be more developments on the value of urban public food procurement programmes. Also reference to some successful participatory guarantee systems to ensure food safety at low cost could be made (Niederle et al, 2020). And Urbal could be mentioned as a valuable participatory impact evaluation method of innovations in urban food systems.

5. The statement p.35 that most of the burden of foodborne disease originates from informal markets surprises me, please check the reliability of the source.
6. I think there should be more emphasis on the link between urban poverty and urban food insecurity, which makes working on other aspects than food supply per se even more critical than in rural settings.

7. About research needs: more data should be available on foodsheds (where food comes from, taking into account different food items and periods of the year, with elements of quantification adapted to the context of informal markets (common absence of standardised units of sale).

8. There are many repetitions in Chapters 5 and 6, for instance about urban food platforms/city councils. The chapters could be substantially reduced. I also find a lot of the sections about food losses in Chapter 4 could be cut when it is not consumer-centered and relates more generally to urban waste management.

Quoted references:


51. Anne Kepple, FAO, Italy

Dear Evariste and Paola,

Congratulations on the zero draft which I do believe covers the key issues. Regarding the specific questions, I am pleased that the report aims to address the additional dimensions of agency and sustainability, but I do feel it falls short on agency (which is admittedly a challenge).

Specifically regarding our area of expertise, I have only a few brief comments on the evidence regarding food insecurity in urban and peri-urban areas. It is essential to have a good grasp of the data on food insecurity by degree of urbanization – the evolution in measurement and monitoring, the limitations, the challenges. For example, reference to (and the chart from) a 2017 academic publication in Section 3.2.1 should be removed given the updated information provided in the 2023 SOFI.

It would be useful to directly address the different measures and urban-rural disaggregation approaches, pointing out that countries use different approaches, and that therefore national estimates are typically not comparable. The DEGURBA categorization used in Chapter 2 of SOFI 2023 is a new international standard endorsed by the UN Statistical Commission (see Box 2 of the SOFI 2023).

We stand by to provide support on these parts of the report as needed.

Please note there is nothing in the SOFI 2023 about lower access to school food programs contributing to the gender gap in food insecurity.

Section 3.2 could be synthesized better with care taken regarding the timeliness, quality and generalizability of the evidence. In our experience from analyses of food insecurity severity (based on the FIES) across Urban Rural Catchment Areas, the results were extremely heterogeneous, pointing to the different realities in different contexts and the difficulty of making generalizations.

Best regards.

Anne W. Kepple
Consultant
Food Security & Nutrition Statistics Team
Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN (FAO)
52. Charles Spillane, Ryan Institute, University of Galway, Ireland

Dear Paola and Evariste,

Hope all is well with you both and all in FAO. Within the UU-IFAD EcoFoodSystems research project that I lead (https://ecofoodsystems.org/) we put together our input to the e-consultation call on the V0 draft of the HLPE-FSN report #19

Many thanks

Prof. Charles Spillane,
Director of Ryan Institute, University of Galway, Ireland, www.RyanInstitute.ie

EcoFoodSystems Info Note

Citation: Hoang K, Alememayeh D, Tessema Y, Rodríguez Plazas C and Spillane C (2024) Inputs, guidance and recommendations from EU/IFAD-funded EcoFoodSystems project to V0 draft of UN Committee on Food Security HLPE-FSN report #19 on “Strengthening urban and peri-urban food systems to achieve food security and nutrition in the context of urbanization and rural transformation. EcoFoodSystems Info Note, 26 January 2024.

Dear Paola, Evariste & members of the CFS High Level Panel of Experts on Food Security and Nutrition (HLPE-FSN),

The following are the inputs, guidance and recommendations from some members of the EU/IFAD-funded EcoFoodSystems project (https://ecofoodsystems.org/), namely Prof. Charles Spillane, Ky (EcoFoodSystems Project Leader), Ky Hoang (EcoFoodSystems Project Researcher), Dawit Alememayehu (EcoFoodSystems Project Researcher), Yared Tessema (EcoFoodSystems Project Researcher), Carlos Rodríguez Plazas (EcoFoodSystems Project Researcher). The EcoFoodSystems project is led by the University of Galway Ireland, with partner organisations Alliance Bioversity-CIAT, Wageningen University and Research (WUR) and Rikolto – Vietnam. The project is funded by the European Union and the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD).

The EcoFoodSystems project and team consider this a valuable draft in terms of compilation and synthesis of concepts, models, and data on urbanization, rural transformation and their implications for food security and nutrition (FSN). We welcome the request for identification of action-oriented policy options for urban and peri-urban food systems that can encourage coordinated policies for FSN across rural, urban and peri-urban areas, taking into account specific and differentiated needs. We welcome the effort put into this document and would like to provide some constructive feedback, guidance and recommendations:

We consider that it is useful to establish key messages at the beginning of each chapter, followed by a synthesis. It could be worth graphically illustrating key messages are contradictory, including contrasts.
between characteristics and opportunities in urban and peri-urban Food Systems. Some of the figures need to be recrafted as higher quality figures (e.g. Fig 3.8, Fig 4.1).

In the current zero draft of the report, urban and peri-urban food system sustainability and its impacts are addressed as deeply or comprehensively as they could be. Areas that could be strengthened include: (1) environmental impacts of food production, distribution, and consumption; (2) economic sustainability (i.e. what diversified income for farmers, what farmers markets can be promoted or supported, what production practices or innovations can reduce input costs while maintaining productivity (e.g. yield/ha) and distribution of value and profits along the value chain of specific commodities; (3) increasing efficiency of supply chains that can minimize food losses and wastes, and lower costs through efficiency gains) and (4) social sustainability (supporting and promoting rural and urban employment to create decent job opportunities in agrifood supply chains). There is also a need for more evidence-based assessment and comparison of policy options on strengthening urban and peri-urban food systems to achieve food security and nutrition.

The section on urban and peri-urban agriculture/food production seems somewhat basic, lacking data on commodity outputs and assessment of capacity to meet overall consumer demand, as well as demand for specific commodities. Additionally, information on agricultural inputs such as seeds, fertilizers, and pesticides seems to be missing.

The food environment section lacks insights into the flows of food, including quantities differentially sourced from urban or peri-urban areas, neighbouring production regions, and/or from international imports. Furthermore, there is scant mention of the role played by the private sector, MSMEs, and youth in urban food systems.

The document does not seem to explore the impact or influence of the transformation of the urban and semi-urban food system on employment, particularly for different demographic groups, including migrants.

In the report, although the contribution of informal and traditional components of urban and peri-urban food systems in production, processing, transport and retail are covered in the report, potential solutions or strategies for the poorest urban residents to address their needs while strengthening or building from the informal sector are not well articulated.

Food losses and waste are identified as a critical challenge to food systems sustainability along the food supply chain. Data on food waste, food loss, and environmental impacts/emissions within the context of urban food system transformation currently do not seem to be covered.

The report could provide more piloted and costed policy options to address this problem urban and peri-urban food systems of low- and middle-income countries. At present the scope is too narrow.

Though challenges and solutions across all domains of the food system are indicated in the report, further integrated discussions and recommendations that connect informality, food safety, food losses and waste, waste management, climate change, dietary diversity, and gender and marginalised group
Intersectionalities within food systems can provide a more systemic approach to strengthening urban and peri-urban food systems. In the conceptual framework, biodiversity is currently not considered as a factor and has little attention in relation to the peri-urban areas, or as part of a healthy food system.

The report highlights the dependence of the city foodsheds on surrounding agricultural production areas, where the discussion on urbanization primarily focuses on administrative boundaries and population growth. However, exploring urban sprawl spatially and temporally and its consequences on the environment, agriculture, and the city’s foodshed are not extensively discussed. Understanding such dynamics could shed more light on the impact of urban expansion on access to food sources (proximal and distal) and the contributions to rural-to-urban migration.

On a related point, the current exploration of urban and peri-food system interconnectedness predominantly centres on physical infrastructures like roads. However, the crucial role of internet and technological infrastructure in facilitating connections between buyers and sellers, online marketing, food delivery, and other aspects of the urban food system is currently overlooked. Recognizing the significance of virtual and technological infrastructure is essential in the context of ever evolving food systems.

The document discusses the increasing number of food outlets associated with urbanization, including the influence of fast-food establishments on urban residents’ food choices based on proximity and food types (e.g., healthy or unhealthy options). Analysing the proximity and presence of different food outlets could aid in understanding their impact on food choices, behaviour, and associated variables such as demographic characteristics and health status.

One aspect could be strengthened in the is the challenge policymakers face to address urban food security arising from the lack of adequate spatial disaggregation of existing national food security data. Addressing this gap is important for development of spatially explicit strategies/policies, and identifying intervention options.

Despite considering a wide range of policy elements and interconnected dimensions of food security, the report remains focused on feeding urban and peri-urban populations. The nested relationships of the rural to urban food supply chain continuum is not strongly considered, especially in relation to the implications of shorter supply chains and circular economy principles in food systems. The impact on GHG emissions arising from different forms of food transportation are not considered across commodity types.

In our recent Liddy et al (2023) paper, our research group identified the challenge of food mapping data, methodologies and systemic integration of food mapping insights into decision-making in city regional food systems. See:

In our recent Karan et al (2023) paper, our research group has identified gaps at the sub-national (and city-regional) level in the availability of data for food systems decision making in city regions. See:


We do hope that these inputs, guidance and recommendation can be helpful to the drafting of successive drafts, ahead of the final draft for the CFS 52th plenary session in October 2024.

53. Massimo Perrino, United Cities and Local Governments, Spain

Official Comment United Cities and Local Governments

3. Are the trends/variables/elements identified in the draft report the key ones to strengthen urban and peri-urban food systems? If not, which other elements should be considered?

Are there any other issues concerning urban and peri-urban food systems that have not been sufficiently covered in the draft report?

Are topics under- or over-represented in relation to their importance?

We believe reference should be made to the Global Taskforce of Local and Regional Governments within the report, specifically, within section 5.4.2. “Embedding cities in transnational networks”.

The Global Taskforce of Local and Regional Governments (GTF) is the coordination and consultation mechanism bringing together the major international networks of local and regional governments worldwide, to undertake joint advocacy related to global policy processes and amplify the voice of local governments in international policy making processes. Its very existence represents a landmark achievement for the international municipal movement. Local and regional governments are the only UN non-state stakeholder to have a mechanism such as the GTF, to develop and coordinate inputs into global policy processes, among others, related to food security and urban food systems.

4. Is there additional quantitative or qualitative data that should be included?

Are there other references, publications, or traditional or different kind of knowledges, which should be considered?
Could you suggest case studies and success stories from countries that were able to strengthen urban and peri-urban food systems? In particular, the HLPE-FSN would seek contributions on:

a) evidence-based examples of successful interventions in urban and peri-urban food systems with the principles behind what made the process work;

An example is the Apici Project which aims to address the challenges posed by the lack of organization among farmers, inadequate rural infrastructure, and limited crop diversity in Siem Reap’s food system. The Apici project fostered transformation of the agricultural sector to enhance the collective marketing of local products and lower production costs for local farmers while bolstering their bargaining power. This involved the establishment of three cooperatives, 36 credit and savings groups, and the initiation of a producers’ market. The structuring of local value chains through cooperatives and the provision of accessible distribution spaces have effectively addressed market access issues for small-scale local farmers thus enhancing their negotiating power, and contributing to the strengthening of food security for both producers and consumers alike.

Reference: RISING TO THE CHALLENGES OF FOOD INSECURITY INITIATIVES BY LOCAL AND REGIONAL GOVERNMENTS - November 2023 - United Cities and Local Governments and Let’s Food
b) efforts made to enhance agency in urban and peri-urban food systems;

An example is São Paulo’s Municipal Council for Food and Nutritional Security (COMUSAN-SP) established in 2013 to ensure the effective implementation of proposed measures by various entities. COMUSAN-SP’s activities involve proposing, monitoring, and inspecting municipal actions related to food and nutritional security, collaborating with civil society organizations and other municipal departments and actively engaging with residents in policy and decision-making processes.

Reference: RISING TO THE CHALLENGES OF FOOD INSECURITY INITIATIVES BY LOCAL AND REGIONAL GOVERNMENTS - November 2023 - United Cities and Local Governments and Let’s Food

c) efforts made to enhance the right to food in urban and peri-urban settings;

In Montpellier, a project called the "Common Food Fund" ("Caisse Alimentaire Commune"), inspired by a national policy to combat food insecurity and promote sustainable, high-quality food, is contributing to ensure access to quality food for all through a universal income that can be utilized for specific products. The initiative was shaped by a citizen committee, involving disadvantaged groups and following principles of participatory democracy, to ensure it reflected the diversity and will of the community.

During a trial period, residents received a monthly allocation of a currency equivalent to spend on approved food products while contributing to a mandatory monthly contribution.

The project securesd support from both public and private funding, as well as membership fees and collaborations with local food distribution outlets and the local public wholesale market.

Reference: RISING TO THE CHALLENGES OF FOOD INSECURITY INITIATIVES BY LOCAL AND REGIONAL GOVERNMENTS - November 2023 - United Cities and Local Governments and Let’s Food

d) examples of circular economy and urban and peri-urban food system and climate change adaptation and mitigation, preferably beyond issues of production; and

One example is the Agroforestry Program for Antananarivo (ASA Program) launched in 2014 which aims to make a sustainable contribution to combating poverty and food insecurity in Madagascar, while also focusing on the preservation of the local environment. The program’s goal is to enhance the income of producers and ensure local communities have access to fresh food and wood energy products.

The program focuses on providing financial and technical assistance to local farmers to encourage the sale of high-quality and nutritious products to peri-urban and urban populations, addressing nutritional deficiencies often prevalent in these areas. These initiatives include building the capacity of producers, assisting in product marketing, the development of business plans, and post-harvest management to reduce food losses.
Beyond addressing immediate agricultural concerns, the ASA program tackles the issue of rural-urban migration, where many Malagasy migrate to Antananarivo in search of opportunities but often face unemployment, poverty, and food insecurity.

Reference: RISING TO THE CHALLENGES OF FOOD INSECURITY INITIATIVES BY LOCAL AND REGIONAL GOVERNMENTS - November 2023 - United Cities and Local Governments and Let’s Food

e) examples of national and local government collaboration on urban and peri-urban food systems.

In the city of Amman, Jordan, the escalating issues of food insecurity have prompted the emergence of urban agriculture. This practice has become an integral part of the municipal agenda since 2007 whereby the city implemented an urban agriculture and food security program, utilizing public land for cultivation. The municipality, through its "Office for Urban Agriculture" and through a collaborative Multilateral Forum involving public and private entities, NGOs, and citizens, has established partnerships with international organizations to encourage residents to produce their own food, supported by the cooperation of various stakeholders and backed by ministries such as Agriculture and the Environment.

Reference: RISING TO THE CHALLENGES OF FOOD INSECURITY INITIATIVES BY LOCAL AND REGIONAL GOVERNMENTS - November 2023 - United Cities and Local Governments and Let’s Food

---

54. Catalina Canas, CANADA, Canada

Input from CANADA

General points • Practitioners vs. Policy: The report could provide more useful analysis to practitioners of urban agriculture and not just facilitate a policy discussion on urban and peri-urban agriculture (UPA). • Science context gap: There is a need for more agronomic measurement, assessment, scenario modeling discussion, need to identify key research questions, and the important role of technology and innovation. The report currently does a poor job of including this real-world context that is crucial to guiding sound policies and devising effective policy instruments.

More specifically:

o Agronomic Constraints: The report is lacking important analysis on the agronomic constraints to urban agriculture, in particular to specify key growth-limiting and growth-reducing abiotic and biotic factors. Strongly suggest inclusion of more thorough agronomic discussion on UPA (perhaps in section 4.5). Many key resources exist but are not referenced (Constraints to urban agriculture in southeast Nigeria | Humanities and Social Sciences Communications (nature.com); Agronomic considerations for urban agriculture in southern cities | 10 (taylorfrancis.com); Sustainability | Free Full-Text | What
Constraints the Expansion of Urban Agriculture in Benin? (mdpi.com); Full article: Which urban agriculture conditions enable or constrain sustainable food production? (tandfonline.com)

Research Agenda: The report seems limited to discussing policies that influence UPA and should provide some analysis and advice on what the key agricultural and economic research questions are that are needed to advance and improve UPA, or how best to frame a research agenda to support UPA. This is important to inform the research agenda of the CGIAR. For example, is UPA better served by research outputs that focus on the urban-rural linkages around local food consumption pathways or are there distinct research questions common across cities in different areas of the world. Propose another section (under 6.0 or new section) that specifies research technical questions for UPA and clarifies if UPA is a distinct area of research and independent of local context, or best addressed within local agricultural research agenda, but by elaborating the rural research agenda into specific urban contexts.

Emerging technologies: There is only a single sentence that mentions emerging technologies such as hydroponics and aeroponics systems, vertical farming, building-integrated agriculture, rooftop agriculture, and controlled environment agriculture. There is also no specific mention of smart farming, precision/decision agriculture, artificial intelligence-based tools for food supply optimization, data collection etc. The report would be strengthened if it included a summary and context on the role of emerging technologies in supporting urban agriculture, resilient and sustainable food systems. The need to prioritize access to technology is highlighted in Section 4.5.1.3 Technology and innovation: drivers of transformation in UPA practices (page 61). Here there needs to be a broader discussion on ways forward for sharing of scientific and technological knowledge, data, tools linked with different technologies.

Urban agriculture growth and water demand: With an estimated 50% increase in urban water demands in the next 30 years, how water is managed is crucial. The report mentions this in different ways, but it would be informative to include available future outlooks on water demand linked with rural agriculture and urban agriculture.

Nature-Based Solutions: Including a section briefly discussing the role of Ecosystem/Nature-based solutions (EbS/NbS) as measures, from a whole-systems perspective, that seek to improve the efficiency, resiliency, and sustainability of food systems, would strengthen the report. Specific Points Section 1.3 Framing questions and core concepts (P.4) The questions seem comprehensive in addressing key aspects of urban and peri-urban food systems. However, there may be some elements that could further enhance the understanding or efficacy of strengthening these systems by drawing attention to cultural aspects as well as technology and innovation: On cultural Aspects, exploring how cultural preferences, traditions, and societal behaviors impact food systems can be crucial. This includes understanding the influence of cultural diversity, food habits, and preferences in shaping these systems. On technology and Innovation, investigating the role of technology and innovation in improving urban and peri-urban food systems can be valuable. This could involve looking at how technological advancements, such as vertical farming, precision agriculture, or food preservation techniques, can contribute to enhancing food security and nutrition.
Chapter 4 | Urban and peri-urban food systems (related to question 3 (p.4)) The structure of this chapter is currently weak. Since this chapter aimed to address question (#3) of the framing questions (What are the characteristics of urban and peri-urban food systems, and what aspects of urban and peri-urban food systems need to be strengthened in order to achieve urban and peri-urban FSN?), one could expect the report to consider the following key elements of the UPA: 1. Supply Chain Dynamics: Examining the complexities within the food supply chain, including transportation, storage, and distribution mechanisms, can offer insights into potential bottlenecks or inefficiencies that affect FSN outcomes. 2. Economic and Market Forces: Considering the influence of market dynamics, trade policies, and economic disparities on food access and affordability in urban and peri-urban areas can provide a holistic view of the challenges faced. Page 26- The report highlights the 'view food insecurity through an intersectional lens' stating that ‘Gender disparities in food insecurity result from shocks and differences in education, income, opportunities, social networks, and entitlements’ Because of the intersectional nature of Food security and Nutrition, there is an opportunity to integrate an intersectional approach throughout the whole report and explore how food insecurity is experienced differently based on overlapping identities. Moreover, the report states that “Explicitly integrating gender in urban food policy and governance through targeted initiatives, research and planning is vital”; However, the report misses an opportunity to mainstream gender throughout the whole document. Furthermore, the report could expand the use of language around gender transformative change in Strengthening urban and peri-urban food systems to achieve food security and nutrition in the context of urbanization and rural transformation. Since intersectionality is such an important factor, the report could mention this word more than once. To make it easier to the reader, the report could include boxes with concrete examples of how more than 2 axis of identity factors such as education, household income, age, disability, race play into the variation of food insecurity incidence. Page 34- C) Convenience: time use, women's roles, and institutional environment shape urban dietary consumption patterns Canada appreciates that the report highlights how gender roles play a role within food security. Page 68 GENDER Canada is pleased to see the report has included a section on Gender However, as mentioned before, the report could consider mainstreaming gender and consider how gender disparities in urban and peri-urban settings influence food insecurity and nutrition. Gender and intersectionality should be informing the whole report. After page 68 the word ‘gender’ is no longer mentioned. Page 68- The sentence: ...by harassment or violence from elements of the public It would be important to elaborate on what are the “elements of the public”. We would recommend being specific, and fully address Gender-Based Violence (GBV) including all forms of harassment and violence within this context. Women and girls are more at risk of GBV, and it should be noted as such, however, the report should be informed by the principles of intersectionality and explore intersection of disability, age, religion, caste and other factors with food insecurity and nutrition. The report continues with mentioning that…. women street vendors had been sexually harassed, with 5% reporting rape. Following, we would recommend rewording this sentence to make clear that women are experiencing Gender-Based Violence (GBV) and address the disturbing correlation between food insecurity and GBV. The sentence `Enabling environments...’ The section should also address GBV. There is vast empirical evidence to support and illustrate this issue. Examples (in a box) would allow the reader to have better understanding of the extent of this problem. This report could include inspiring examples, with stories that illustrates concrete actions to prevent, penalize GBV and advocate to transformative gender change Page 86 - According to the HLPE (2020: 14), “a food and nutrition policy approach that is grounded in a sustainable food systems framework embodies critical policy shifts that have been
occurring in recent decades and which have been consistently advocated by the HLPE across all of its reports (HLPE, 2017d). This report builds on those six critical policy shifts and associated policy recommendations, making explicit what are the most salient characteristics of those changes for urban and peri-urban food systems, as stated below. It would be helpful to list the six critical policy shifts as a reminder to the readers, (e.g. a footnote or a box text)


Specifically, we note that various aspects related to environmental constraints and opportunities for urban agriculture and foodsheds are not well represented. The environmental framing is noted on page 19, as is stated  

“Therefore, better food waste management in urban areas represents an opportunity to cut into emissions while resolving other issues around energy, soil quality, waste management and human health.”. While highlighting here that urban and peri-urban agriculture may play a role in greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reductions, seemingly, there is an absence of a larger review of the environmental consequences and constraints of urban agriculture. More work is needed on the quantified GHG emission profiles, food production, and their respective drivers, and this could be enhanced in the document. With regards to GHG targets, urban and peri-urban agriculture can directly reduce GHGs through 1) nature-based climate solutions including carbon sequestration in crops and soils in cities; and 2) reductions in carbon emissions due to avoided land-use change and
agricultural expansion, vis-à-vis food production on mixed-use lands. In the document, a review of urban soils in GHG emissions reductions, and other environmental constraints to strengthening urban agriculture, namely soil fertility, soil contamination and soil restoration, could be included.

In regards to foodsheds, on the one hand, the document recognizes that cities' foodsheds range from local to distant lands (p. 62). Yet figures 1.2 and 1.3 for city foodsheds give the impression that an urban foodshed is local, or regional. But rather instead of a border, arguably, we need to be thinking of foodsheds from an ecosystems perspective.

Finally, while diversity and resiliency is explored in section 4.6.5., the document lacks explicit emphasis on agrobiodiversity and pollinator diversity in cities, and the role of culturally appropriate crop diversity and diverse seed sources in cities. These agroecological aspects are key to strengthening the sustainability of urban and peri-urban agriculture.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback.

Sustainable Food and Farming Futures Cluster, University of Toronto Scarborough, Toronto, Canada

56. Nevin Cohen, City University of New York School of Public Health, United States of America

This is a thorough and extremely well-written report on urban food systems. It is comprehensive and yet clearly explains the complexity of urban and regional food systems and urban food policy choices. There are several areas in which I feel the report could be strengthened and made more relevant to policy makers and advocates:

While there are discussions throughout about social determinants of malnourishment like poverty and time scarcity, and a short section on the interconnectedness of food and other policies, the discussion of those upstream factors should be more central to the report, as issues of poverty, inequality, and the exploitation and oppression stemming from social determinants of health are key to addressing food security and nutrition. An upstream focus also suggests the need for new pathways to change food systems, such as immigration policy, civil rights laws, housing, education, childcare, and health services, and justice-focused climate policies.

Related to this point, the report should more clearly and prominently address the true cost of living in cities, which varies significantly North and South, from large to small cities, and between those connected to the global economy and those in "disarticulated" economies (c.f. Amin, de Janvry). There are movements to measure true costs, as opposed to conventional poverty measures, as a recent charter revision in NYC illustrates, and to identify necessary interventions (e.g., subsidized rents) to facilitate healthier, more equitable conditions.
The idea of social oppression (of women, people of color, immigrants, lower castes, etc.) as a root cause of food system inequities is woven throughout but I think deserves clearer articulation in the report.

The concept of the foodshed is a useful construct, yet more attention should be paid to their interactions with alternative geographies of food systems, e.g., transnational food supply chains, digitally mediated distribution channels, social-media information flows, cultural foodsheds experienced by migrants. Just as the concept of a foodshed, first articulated by Walter Hedden in 1929, was based on the technology of the time (e.g., milksheds were smaller than foodsheds due to the limits of refrigerated transport), foodsheds are evolving in response to digitalization. More deliberately discussing trends in food system geographies, e.g., digitalization and its effect on local food distribution and global shifts in food practices, would be valuable.

Economic inequality and social disparities are discussed throughout, but a more explicit discussion of food gentrification would help to explain food retail transitions (e.g., supermarketization), the consequences (intended or unintended) of infrastructure and housing investments on food prices and access, and the exacerbation of social disparities reflected in food availability as cities change, especially for pockets of low income people remaining within increasingly affluent surrounding neighborhoods (e.g., social housing residents in gentrified neighborhoods). The politics (e.g., rezoning, public investments) and impact of urban development on food environments of existing residents are rarely considered and this report should focus attention on the oversight.

While the report addresses the role of private business (e.g., supermarketization, marketing) in shaping food environments, I think a more explicit discussion of the commercial determinants of food security and nutrition is warranted. Food marketing is more than targeted, it often preys on low income, minoritized communities. The food system is one of the largest employers of low-wage, often disempowered workers in cities, and this is likely to accelerate as digital platforms become an increasingly common way to exploit vulnerable workers. Food corporations have shaped and increasingly shape food products, tastes, consumption patterns, and food buying and preparation practices. The report mentions interventions like soda taxes and controls on advertising, and incentives for healthy food, but a discussion of the role of corporations in shaping urban development, city infrastructure, the political process, policies like taxes, and therefore the food system – and the potential and limits of cities counteracting corporate power – would be a valuable contribution.

I would suggest more explicit and detailed attention to food labor, as it is both a source of exploitation and poverty but also could be a route to healthier food (e.g., in public canteens with upskilling of cooks) and higher wage jobs. The labor movement could be an ally of FSN advocates. Examples of food labor activism are most prominent in the Global North, but not exclusively.

Related to food labor, the report discusses right-to-food framing but should discuss the role of activism in reframing, making salient, and advancing policy in urban food systems. In my experience, food policy councils are helpful but inherently moderate voices for change. Food riots, strikes and boycotts, insurgent urbanism actions (e.g., taking over land to grow or sell food) put issues on the front burner and motivate lawmakers to act. How do activist movements relate to governmental and government processes? What strategies work? What support is needed to make them successful?
The report discusses future trends throughout, but it might be helpful to have a section on urban food futures. Climate change is obviously a game changer, both in terms of its impact on periurban agriculture but also its impact on urban budgets and priorities, development patterns, investment in risk mitigation, population migration, food safety, etc. But other trends are important as well: digitalization; AI and food knowledge; Ozempic and other new anti-obesity medications; political trends such as the rise of authoritarian governments and the potential for widening income inequalities.

57. Sophia Torres, Global Platform for the Right to the City, Brazil

Dear HLPE - FSN Team,

Thanks for the opportunity to comment.

The proposed framework is welcome and pertinent, particularly as it introduces a multi-scalar approach, engaging with a human rights perspective and community-based approaches. We particularly welcome the inclusion of the Right to the City framework, as to engaged with the territorial, political, social, environmental and economic dimensions of food sovereignty. However, a more nuanced incorporation of community-based approaches towards food security and food sovereignty would benefit the analysis. We further detail these recommendations below.

Kind regards,

Sophia Torres and the Global Platform for the Right to the City team

The below listed comments follow and respond to the guiding questions provided in the e-consultation:

1. Do you find the proposed framework effective to highlight and discuss the key issues concerning urban and peri-urban food systems? / Is this a useful conceptual framework to provide practical guidance for policymakers? / Can you offer suggestions for examples to illustrate and facilitate the operationalization of the conceptual framework to address issues relevant for FSN?

The proposed framework is welcome and pertinent, particularly as it introduces a multi-scalar approach, engaging with a human rights perspective and community-based approaches. However, a more nuanced incorporation of community-based approaches towards food security and food sovereignty would be welcomed.

Community based-approaches offer important possibilities for advancing more inclusive urban-rural linkages, through a human rights approach. Given their substantive contributions, three concrete mechanisms are worth noticing. First, and broadly speaking, the social and solidarity economy (SEE),
which encompasses different kinds of social enterprises such as cooperatives, mutual benefit societies, associations, foundations and nonprofits organizations dedicated to the production of goods, services and knowledge that respond to economic and social aims and foster solidarity (ILO 2009). Based on a strong set of principles and values, the social and solidarity economy promotes the protection of the social and environmental functions over the accumulation of profits, and thus is being increasingly recognized as a viable alternative to address both ecological degradation and growing socio-economic inequality. Moreover, the social and solidarity economy complements and expands the postulates of the circular economy, driving more socially and environmentally sustainable modes of production and consumption by not only addressing the need to limit the exploitation of natural resources but also promoting decent work opportunities (social protection, equity and equality). The Intercontinental Network for the Promotion of the Social and Solidarity Economy (RIPESS in Spanish), founded in the late 1990s, has been a fundamental actor fostering learning and advocacy processes at different levels, including the creation of the United Nations Inter Agency Task Force on Social and Solidarity Economy which was instrumental for the approval of the resolution “Promoting the Social and Solidarity Economy for Sustainable Development” by the UN General Assembly in 2023.

The second mechanism refers to cooperatives more in particular. They are defined by the International Co-operative Alliance (ICA) and the International Labour Organization (ILO) as “autonomous associations of persons united voluntarily to meet their common economic, social, and cultural needs and aspirations through a jointly-owned and democratically-controlled enterprise”. Cooperatives are based on the key principle of promoting solidarity and decent work, through promoting alternatives to traditional models of individual private property of companies and distribution of gains generated by the economic activities. Moreover, cooperatives can play a critical role in advancing more sustainable models for the management of natural resources in four central topics connecting rural and urban areas: food, water, energy and waste management. In this case, understanding such goods as commons opens the door for collective management and distribution mechanisms different from public and private ones. According to ICA, at least 12% of the global population is engaged in a cooperative and there are three million cooperatives worldwide. StreetNet and Women in Informal Employment Globalizing and Organizing (WIEGO) are two relevant organizations that have been promoting the creation of cooperatives among workers in the so-called informal economy, such as street vendors and waste-pickers.

Together with their affiliates, they have recently developed a methodology and calculator tool to show how ‘inclusive recycling’ contributes to reducing greenhouse emissions.

Third, and in a similar manner to cooperatives, community-supported agriculture is an alternative under the social and solidarity economy umbrella that is based on ensuring the social inclusion and fair income for small-scale farmers --the majority of them women--, who deliver 70% of the food produced globally using less 25% of the agricultural land (Hitchman forthcoming 2023). The support of such small-scale production can guarantee not only a more even distribution of resources and profits, but also the adoption of more environmentally sustainable modes of food production, distribution and consumption. The framework of agroecology is relevant in this sense, which when coupled with the notion of agroforestry, can play a fundamental role in preserving ecosystems that are increasingly absorbed under urban sprawl. With a membership of around three million families, the global
network URGENCI promotes Local Solidarity-Based Partnerships for Agroecology that bring together a broad range of actors (i.e. producers, consumers, activists, researchers, and public officials) committed to foster relations of proximity and socio-environmental justice.

Local, regional and national governments are responsible for creating and protecting the enabling conditions for these mechanisms to be applied and maintained over time. A combination of legal frameworks, institutional design and dedicated policies has proven to be crucial in countries around the world (Utting 2017, Utting 2022). There is growing recognition of the significant role that the social and solidarity economy plays as a sector, and measures to support it include: financing, fiscal incentives and market access; multi-scalar governance arrangement and co-construction of policies; training and certification; knowledge building and dissemination; public-SSE partnerships and preferential public procurement. From a physical and territorial dimension, it is key to guaranteeing fair access to adequate infrastructures and services. Paramount among them are land; production, storage and distribution facilities; communication and transportation systems. In that sense, beyond subsidies and financial support, governments can also support SSE initiatives through direct (permanent or temporary) transfer of such resources, which are then managed collectively through communities, as in the case of Community Land Trusts. Such an arrangement has been recommended in the New Urban Agenda (2016) as an effective strategy to preserve traditional agricultural land, protecting it from speculation (Hitchman, forthcoming 2023). Through a scope of such varied actions, the combination of the right to the city (see more below) and the social and solidarity economy provides concrete, transformative tools for advancing rural-urban linkages that foster economic, socio-spatial and environmental justice.

2. Does the V0 draft cover sufficiently the implications of this broader definition in urban and peri-urban food systems?

We recommend that to fully cover the socio-spatial, economic and political implications of the proposed approach in urban and peri-urban food systems the paper would benefit in engaging more with an approach based on the concept of food sovereignty. Even if mentioned a handful of times in the draft, the concept is not fully presented and engaged with.

As developed in the publication “Beyond urban-rural linkages, the defense of territories and cities for life” (Global Platform for the Right to the City, 2022): “Food sovereignty is based on the following principles: 1) focusing on food for people; 2) valuing food providers; 3) localizing food systems; 4) making decisions locally; 5) building knowledge and skills; and 6) working with nature. Food sovereignty raises seeds, land, water, knowledge, biodiversity as common goods and as crucial elements for the material, symbolic and spiritual sustenance for peoples”. It recognizes the interdependence between (agro) biodiversity and cultural diversity, opposing the homogeneity of agro-industrial systems and processes of corporate capture, while also fostering solidarity between producers and consumers (Gutierrez, 2019). Along these lines, resonances and coincidences exist with the postulates of energy sovereignty which opposes extractivism, corporate energy monopolies and mega-projects that are harmful to the environment, defending the right of people to decide what source of energy to exploit, how much to produce, how, by whom, where and for whom (Del Bene, Soler and Roa, 2019). Both food sovereignty and energy sovereignty demands considerations about territories and collective/participatory and localized decision making mechanisms as a result of coexistence relations between communities and nature.
Recommendations to ensure food sovereignty at the local level include:

- Ensure meaningful participation of small-scale food producers, Indigenous Peoples and food system workers in decision making processes which impact their territory.
- Ensure that land use regulations include multiscale, transdisciplinary and intercultural approaches to safeguard the protection of ecosystems and to guarantee food and water sources. This must be done in the framework of planning decisions and processes that include and benefit communities, indigenous populations and small local producers, through an intersectional, gender-based approach.
- Create urban land use regulations and support mechanisms that allow the development of family or community agriculture, as a complementary strategy to the provision of local food in cities.
- Facilitate access to responsible and adequate public financing, as well as incentives that promote sustainable small and medium-scale agroecological practices.
- Establish national and local public policies for food and agriculture to promote the observation, preservation and value of the ancestral knowledge systems in food production, the defense of land and the care for the environment.
- Implement technical assistance and training programs with an emphasis on sustainable production and less dependence on external inputs, recognizing and strengthening the role of women, and contributing to reducing existing inequality gaps.
- Promote the preservation of sustainable food systems and the generation of green urban and peri-urban spaces for agriculture and forests in cities, particularly as a mechanism for building resiliency in face of threats such as COVID-19 and climate change.

Relevant sources:


3. Are there any other issues concerning urban and peri-urban food systems that have not been sufficiently covered in the draft report? / Are topics under- or over-represented in relation to their importance?

We welcome the incorporation of the right to the city approach to the draft, however we believe that it could be further described and articulated, as to fully represent the democratic, social and territorial implications of such an approach to ensure food sovereignty. Below you can find some elements of note.
Arising from social mobilization and proposals by civil society organizations, and enshrined in legislation and policies at local, national and international level, the right to the city has been defined as “the right of all inhabitants, present and future, permanent and temporary, to inhabit, use, occupy, produce, govern and enjoy just, inclusive, safe and sustainable cities, villages and human settlements, defined as commons essential to a full and decent life.” The city is understood as a political community in charge of taking care of the collective wellbeing, and not just as a collection of buildings and physical infrastructures. Considered as a collective right, the right to the city underpins the integrity and interdependence of all internationally recognized civil, political, economic, social, cultural and environmental rights, as codified in international human rights treaties. Moreover, the right to the city framework emphasizes the territorial dimension of such rights, with a focus on guaranteeing adequate life standards and democratic decision-making. It also provides a productive framework from which to claim new rights (i.e. public space, energy, care, to mention only a few that are already under discussion in several cities/countries).

The right to the city is connected to the vision of inclusive, sustainable and decentralized, cities and human settlements; which ensure job opportunities, health, education, leisure and culture for all its inhabitants. To further materialize and operationalize such a vision, the right to the city can be articulated around eight key components: no discrimination; gender equality; inclusive citizenship; enhanced political participation; fulfilled social functions; quality public spaces and services; diverse and inclusive economies; and inclusive rural-urban linkages.

By recognizing the need to incorporate and rebalance urban-rural linkages, the right to the city promotes an integrated territorial perspective relevant for all types of settlements and their surrounding habitats, from small towns and villages, to intermediary cities and expanded metropolitan areas. Such an approach seeks to go beyond simplified dichotomies based on abstract administrative categorizations that invisibilize the real fluxes and interconnections at both material and symbolic dimensions. Instead, diverse phenomena are conceived as interwoven processes and relations: environmental (ecosystems, watersheds, climates, etc.); social (migration, family and community networks, organizational forms); economic (production, distribution, consumption, recycling and final disposition circuits); political (legal frameworks, policies and programmes); and cultural (language, traditions, collective imaginaries).

The defense and guarantee of the social and environmental functions of territories is a cornerstone of the right to the city. This refers to the equitable distribution of the burdens and benefits of economic processes, and their territorial impact, including urbanization. This is of particular relevance under a context in which the current mainstream economic and development models, guided through the logic of resource extraction and accumulation of profits, often result in scenarios of increasing social-economic and territorial inequalities, exclusion and environmental degradation. As a response, the right to the city is centered around the prioritization of the socio-economic function of land and the city, through a strengthening of community-based processes and democratic management of the city, with the support and flourishing of more diverse and inclusive economies, recognizing informal work and supporting the social and solidarity economy. It also incorporates an intersectional approach that is intrinsically feminist, anti-racist, anti-ableist, intergenerational, and aligned with the emancipation and autonomy of those traditionally marginalized and excluded.
Learning from Indigenous Peoples worldviews, the right to the city reclaims the deep relationality of the web of life that brings together humans and nature. Going beyond an utilitarian point of view, the intersection between human rights, the right to the city, and the rights of nature makes it possible to identify four key action points to advance towards cities and territories for care and wellbeing. These have been articulated in the publication “Beyond urban and rural linkages, the defense of territories and cities for life” (Paredes et al, 2022) and are summarized as follows:

- Responsible production and consumption: a critical and conscious attitude from consumers and companies based on the protection of the planet and the guarantee of human rights;
- Food sovereignty: which sees seeds, land, water, knowledge, biodiversity as common goods, recognizing the interdependence between (agro) biodiversity and cultural diversity, and fostering solidarity between producers and consumers;
- Defense and care of territories: drawing attention to the urgent need to eliminate the causes that destroy the material, social and cultural bases of a relational, dignified life in territories;
- Solidarity economy: built around a framework in which economic actions aim at satisfying the needs of human beings and protecting the environment, rather than prioritizing capital profits.

4. Are there other references, publications, or traditional or different kinds of knowledge, which should be considered?

Even though the publication mentions traditional markets, there's no direct reference to the importance of indigenous and ancestral practices and knowledge. Inclusive urban-rural linkages should fully integrate and support such knowledge and practices through (but not limited to):

- Ensure legal recognition of territories belonging to ancestral communities, including recognition and protection of collective tenure of land, organizational forms and endogenous instruments of spatial and territorial planning.
- Establish national and local public policies for food and agriculture to promote the observation, preservation and value of the ancestral knowledge systems in food production, the defense of land and the care for the environment.
- Outline institutional structures, local regulatory frameworks, programs and projects that support indigenous peoples, nationalities and communities, in the care and reproduction of common goods, safeguarding forms of communal organization for production, marketing and exchange of products, goods and services, under the principles of sustainability.
- Create incentives and ensure public funding for academia to work with local communities in researching and developing epistemological frameworks that include ancestral knowledge and practices of indigenous peoples and local communities, thus helping create alternative models of organization, creation, participatory/collective decision making, production and commercialization of common goods and public services based on social, environmental and economic sustainability.
6. Could you suggest case studies and success stories from countries that were able to strengthen urban and peri-urban food systems?

Across the global south and the global north, many inspiring efforts exist that seek to disrupt the unfair distribution of burdens and benefits of conventional development processes. The publication “Beyond urban-rural linkages, the defense of territories and cities for life” (Global Platform for the Right to the City, 2022) sheds light on examples regarding the aspects of solidarity economies, food sovereignty, responsible production and consumption, as well as movements focusing on bringing environmental and territorial justice. These experiences are rooted in the defense of the social and environmental function of territories, and present alternative actions based on more equitable, collective, and complementary approaches. Such examples make it possible to identify the types of actions needed to transform current patterns of production and consumption, and to reexamine the planning and management of territories. Examples can be found here: https://www.right2city.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/07_Right-to-the-City-Rural_EN_OK2.pdf


3) According to ILO, 61% of the workers in the world are employed in the informal economy (without social protection and/or official registration of the business they work for).

4) For more details about this initiative see https://www.wiego.org/ghg.

5) For its part, the New Urban Agenda (NUA) refers to cities and human settlements for all, with equality in their use and enjoyment, emphasizing inclusion, non-discrimination and an intergenerational perspective. The Agenda frames its common ideal in the right to the city. When considering the interaction and connectivity between urban and rural areas, the NUA also proposes to strengthen sustainable mobility and transportation systems, as well as technology and communications infrastructure networks, to make the most of the territorial potential, improving productivity, social and economic cohesion and environmental security and sustainability, based on planning instruments which focus on integrated urban and territorial development. Additionally, in 2019, UN-Habitat issued a document containing guiding principles for the generation of urban-rural linkages as a framework for action to advance integrated territorial development. This document proposes 10 principles which offer guidance on the implementation of the guidelines established in the NUA and articulated to the SDG. The principles revolve around: local interventions, integrated governance, spatial and functional systemic
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approach, financial inclusion, balanced partnerships, human rights, social protection and non-violence pact, environmental sustainability, active participation and data-driven decisions (UN-Habitat, 2019).”


9) As recognized in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948), the International Convenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966), the International Convenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (1966) and other related international documents. After decades in the making, access to a clear, healthy and sustainable environment was declared by the United Nations General Assembly as a universal human right in July 2022. The right to the city and its components are included in the New Urban Agenda (2016), as well as in national and local instruments, such as the City's Statute from Brazil (2001), the Constitution of Ecuador (2008) and the Mexico City Constitution (2017). The World Charter for the Right to the City (2005), promoted by social movements and civil society organizations, has played a crucial role in this process. Local and regional governments have also recognized the relevance of the right to the city, incorporating it as part of the World Charter Agenda for Human Rights in the City (2011).

10) Over the past three years, the Global Platform for the Right to the City has facilitated the elaboration of a series of thematic papers that deepen the conceptualization of these components and provide related recommendations for public policies. The paper on rural-urban linkages is available at https://www.right2city.org/document/thematic-documented-beyond-urban-rural-linkages/

58. Yvonne Maffei, My Halal Kitchen, United States of America

Dear HLPE-FSN team,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback, and thank you for considering my suggestions. Overall, the document is a thorough, thoughtful and well-written report. I have just a few comments I hope you will consider.

Re: the chart on page 4 (Sustainable Food Systems)- it might be wise to clarify which of the two blocks implies “economic viability”: either Access (equitable) or Availability (productive and prosperous). It is clarified on p. 31 but not on the chart.

Global Forum on Food Security and Nutrition  www.fao.org/fsnforum
This is a critical statement (p. 5): Definitions used and criteria created need to align with the questions to be asked of them. Central to this report is the notion that urban and peri-urban areas should not simply be viewed in technical terms. It could be useful to not only expand on this statement a little more, but to also shift this part to an earlier section of the document (i.e. the intro, 1.1). Section 1.3.3 is expansive on this subject, of course, but since it is the topic of the report, it could be shifted to the beginning, as well.

P. 8 - An important statement here - "Relatedly, food systems in much of the Global South have been shaped by policy prescriptions that orient them towards production for export and reliance on imports, which undermines the potential of local production for local consumption. This raises important questions addressed in the report about the power of individual cities to shape their food systems in the context of global trade regimes."-- perhaps the added mention of covid and post-covid realizations about the priority of domestic food security for many of these countries has added value for future policy prescriptions.

Figure 1.4: Conceptual framework for the report (p. 11) - the size of the font is making it very hard to read.

p. 35- (D) on the topic of marketing to children. This is a critical topic and deserves significant expansion, particularly on the consumers of the future. Could data be included related to age and gender vis a vis projection of future nutritional statistics as it relates to the current food/nutrition marketing practices towards children and the future of FSN?

Lastly, I would like to make a serious recommendation for the inclusion of specialty diets and their link to strengthening the global supply chain and thus global food security and nutrition. This became even more evident during and post-Covid era. Throughout the document there is no mention of Halal, Kosher, vegan or vegetarian diets, yet the global demand for these types of ingredients and food products is rising rapidly, particularly in urban and peri-urban settings. The Halal sector is of particular economic importance due to its projected $2T market potential and the significant impact it has and will continue to have on the global supply chain. I'm happy to expand on this topic further and/or to contribute data and references should the HLPE-FSN team wish to include it in this report.

Thank you very much for considering my feedback. I hope it provides helpful recommendations.

Yvonne M. Maffei
Dear HLPE - FSN Team

Thank-you for the opportunity to provide feedback on this report. This report provides a much needed critique and synthesis of urban, peri-urban (UPU) and rural food system elements and relationships. Policy makers and development practitioners from a diversity of fields will find this report a key "go to" reference. As is the function of HLPE - FSN reports and given the complexity of the topic, the report brings together, in a succinct and coherent narrative, evidence of the character of UPU food systems across planning, policy instruments and institutional enablers including budgets, environment, nutrition, multi-level and scale governance, mobilising local agency and many more dimensions with address of cross cutting considerations e.g. inclusion and equity. Particular recognition of the experiences and vital role the informal food sector plays especially for low-income communities in urban areas who are the most vulnerable to all forms of malnutrition re: livelihoods, food safety, access and availability as well as informal - formal food systems relationships (e.g. Table 4.1) is acknowledged and much needed. This is also a push-pull systems opportunity between rural landscapes, communities and UPU spaces and one that as multiple transformative levers, local agency and resilience potential. Attached please find my responses to the questions posed by the HLPE-FSN team

Kind Regards, Dr Annie Trevenen-Jones

1. The V0 draft introduces a conceptual framework informed by key principles established in previous HLPE-FSN reports (HLPE, 2017; HLPE, 2020). Do you find the proposed framework effective to highlight and discuss the key issues concerning urban and peri-urban food systems? Is this a useful conceptual framework to provide practical guidance for policymakers?

- As part of the HLPE report series the conceptual framework continues to be a reference point. The previous additions of agency (empowerment) and sustainable (regenerative) are valued and addressed through-out this report. Even so more needs to be said with regards to agency and sustainable.
  - Agency. The report would benefit from further explicit address in terms of how this is part of context specific engagements with different actors and scales of interaction and territories, local ownership, indigenous community perspectives and unpacking "empowerment". While well intentioned, "empowerment" in the field ranges from top down training approaches to advocacy and mobilisation through capacitation workshops and tools to the innovative, more inclusive and respectful co-design approaches (linked to community based participation approaches and Design Thinking).
  - Sustainable. Would be valuable to further elaborate on how this connects with inclusion, equitability and just food systems transformation as well as socio-ecological systems resilience. Regenerative is mentioned in the report - albeit this should be broadly conceptualised as many working in food systems have specific preferences for regenerative vs agro-ecological vs sustainable agriculture etc. The connecting link between different preferences being grounded in principles.
This report provides a much needed critique and synthesis of urban, peri-urban (UPU) and rural food system elements and relationships. Policy makers and development practitioners from a diversity of fields will find this report a key "go to" reference. As is the function of HLPE-FSN reports and given the complexity of the topic, the report brings together, in a succinct and coherent narrative, evidence of the character of UPU food systems across planning, policy instruments and institutional enablers including budgets, environment, nutrition, multi-level and scale governance, mobilising local agency and many more dimensions with address of cross cutting considerations e.g. inclusion and equity.

2. The report adopts the broader definition of food security (proposed by the HLPE-FSN in 2020), which includes six dimensions of food security: availability, access, utilization, stability, agency and sustainability. Does the V0 draft cover sufficiently the implications of this broader definition in urban and peri-urban food systems?

3. Are the trends/variables/elements identified in the draft report the key ones to strengthen urban and peri-urban food systems? If not, which other elements should be considered? Are there any other issues concerning urban and peri-urban food systems that have not been sufficiently covered in the draft report? Are topics under- or over-represented in relation to their importance?

- **Actors**: The explicit choice of "actors" rather than stakeholders re: terminology and concept, offers clarity and guidance for many of us working in food systems who often grapple as to which term/concept to use - with many competing arguments for both.

- **Defining Urban**: Address of the on-going challenge re: universal definition of urban was a fundamental section in this report offers a valuable platform for further discussions on how best to approach what is "urban"? vs "what isn't and why?". The supporting diagrams (Fig. 1.2 and 1.3) will likely be resourced by many going forward.

- **Push and Pull factors**: Reporting on push and pull factors re: urbanization highlights a valuable transformative perspective which organizations like the Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition (GAIN) who are working with communities, governments and multiple sectors in the rural and UPU space have adopted as a consequence of learnings around food systems re: availability and access of diverse, sufficient, safe, and nutritious foods during the COVID-19 pandemic. This also offers opportunity for public and private sector, communities, development organizations and researchers to explore and engage re: connecting rural and UPU food systems in diverse, innovative ways that are co-beneficial and enhance systems resilience. This also links to the UN-Habitat rural-urban framework, systems thinking, and circular "zero waste" models.

- **Secondary and Mega Cities**: Mention in the report of the valuable role secondary cities can and do play through their proximity and more intimate food systems relationships with rural landscapes and communities is noted. Possibly more could be said on secondary cities with respect to push and pull opportunities including between secondary cities and larger mega cities. This additional link is important given that most mega cities of the future will be located in the Global South esp. SSA and Southern and Southeast Asia – regions which also experience the highest moderate to severe food insecurity and multiple nutrition challenges (SOFI 2023 report).
- **Gender:** is mentioned in the report and has a separate sub-section. Even so, throughout the report, more could have been said about gender from different barriers experienced in the food system and in different UPU contexts, inclusion of women to influencing agenda and granular perspectives re: men and women.

- **City Networks and Consortia:** The report mentions the role of city networks and agreements like the Milan Urban Food Policy Pact, C40, ICLEI etc and overarching consortia like the UNFSS Coalition on Sustainable and Inclusive Urban Food Systems re: urban governance and food systems. Perhaps a table contrasting these networks and consortia re: approaches etc would be useful. Additionally the value add of Coalitions like the aforementioned one is the endeavour to facilitate engagement and shared experiences/learnings/tools between national and local-city governments with the aim of a)enhancing coherent, coordinated food systems governance across sectors and regions; and b) advocate and influence national and global food systems and nutrition for the critical role of cities in food systems transformation as well as impact spanning availability and access to safe, healthy diets as well as livelihoods, public health, biodiversity, fresh water, land use, climate change etc.

- **Blue food systems:** There has been a tendency, globally, to preference agri-food systems and it is appreciated that this report provides several references to blue-food systems.

4. Is there additional quantitative or qualitative data that should be included? Are there other references, publications, or traditional or different kind of knowledges, which should be considered?

The report attempts to provide a few case studies with qualitative insights which adds value. The extent to which the report can provide further quantitative - qualitative data is a matter of balance, HLPE criterion and volume constraints of the report.

- **Accessibility:** It is worth noting that a lot of data and evidence is “locked into” hard copy and online reports, technical databases, academic papers and multi-media including videos and which do not lend themselves to easy, convenient access to those in the public sector, communities and other active agents of change. Language constraints further hamper this.

- **Innovative resources like FoodActionCities (GAIN, RUAF, Milan Urban Food Policy Pact) [www.foodactioncities.org](http://www.foodactioncities.org) - unlock UPU information including learnings and sharing of tools and practices to decision makers across the world via mobile phones and computers with accessibility for new and older operating systems, is open to cities and other actors including city networks to easily submit content and promotes just food systems transformation.**

- **Food Systems Dashboard (John Hopkins University, GAIN, FAO, Columbia Climate School and CornellCALS) [https://www.foodsystemsdashboard.org](https://www.foodsystemsdashboard.org) - is a quantitative and useful tool albeit providing aggregated national and global food systems data and policy options. Sub-national food systems dashboards are presently in development in several SSA and Asian countries that provide disaggregated and more granular systems data. Even so, it is important to recognize the political dimension of data when compiling open source dashboards that are widely accessible.**

- **City and UPU food systems data:** this is unique and vital but lacking. It often has different formal and informal data forms (of which less if known about the informal food sector) which are administratively gathered and/or quickly aggregated into higher administrative quantifications.
5. Are there any redundant facts or statements that could be eliminated from the V0 draft? Nothing to add.

6. Could you suggest case studies and success stories from countries that were able to strengthen urban and peri-urban food systems? In particular, the HLPE-FSN would seek contributions on:

a) evidence-based examples of successful interventions in urban and peri-urban food systems with the principles behind what made the process work; b) efforts made to enhance agency in urban and peri-urban food systems; c) efforts made to enhance the right to food in urban and peri-urban settings; d) examples of circular economy and urban and peri-urban food system and climate change adaptation and mitigation, preferably beyond issues of production; and e) examples of national and local government collaboration on urban and peri-urban food systems.

GAIN’s policy option toolkits and collaborative approaches, engaging government and traditional/informal food market actors in Mozambique, Kenya and Pakistan as part of COVID-19 and building back better responses could be of interest. See: https://www.gainhealth.org/resources/reports-and-publications/policy-options-toolkits Notably this work had moved on with further development and in places (including scaling) interventions to helps national and city governments (and parts of the informal food sector) implement countries UNFSS pathway commitments.
The first sentence, "their food offerings often consist of high-fat and high-sugar foods, fast food, and other unhealthy options, which is why greater access to these types of businesses is often associated with higher obesity rates," is a description of convenience stores in general, and does not necessarily apply to individual convenience stores.

However, mentioning the name of individual convenience stores in the second sentence could be misinterpreted as if those convenience stores offer unhealthy products. If the report wants to mention that the number of convenience stores is increasing, the description should be based on data for convenience stores in general, not for individual convenience stores.

Regarding 7-Eleven convenience stores in Japan, which are individually named, we would like to introduce that they are actively working to achieve sustainability by pursuing food quality and safety, such as selling health-conscious products, developing environmentally friendly products, reducing CO2 emissions, and taking measures to prevent food loss.

Kindly please see the reference links below (English, Arabic, Chinese, and Korean are available):

Seven-Eleven Sustainability | Seven-Eleven ~ Close-by, Convenient ~ (sej.co.jp)

Pursuit of quality and safety | Seven-Eleven ~ Close-by, Convenient ~ (sej.co.jp)

61. Alison Blay-Palmer, Wilfrid Laurier University, Canada

Dr. Alison Blay-Palmer, UNESCO Chair on Food Biodiversity and Sustainability Studies. Waterloo, Canada

General Comments: Thanks for the opportunity to comment.

This report is a much-needed call for policy-makers and decision-makers to pay attention to urban and peri-urban food systems. The authors do an excellent job focusing the reader’s attention on urban/peri-urban food security and nutrition including along the food chain. I do have one constructive suggestion that could improve the report and give it broader relevance. While Section 4.5 deals with food production in rural areas and also considerations national and other scales, this report offers a unique opportunity to build solidarity with those seeking to enhance sustainable territorial food systems (based on e.g. city region food systems, bioregions, foodsheds etc). Urban/peri-urban food security requires the production of adequate quantities of ecologically produced, healthy, culturally appropriate, affordable food to be delivered with minimal waste into urban distribution centres and local retailers to enable street vendors and low income/marginalized households, and others, to have food security and fair livelihoods. If the territory isn't working as a system as much as possible, then urban/peri-urban food systems are ultimately at the mercy of the industrial food system. I appreciate this is not the focus of this important report but adding this dimension could make the report more impactful as it is published and considered by policy and decision makers.
In response to Question 3:

In addition to comments above, specific to Section 4.5.2 It is not clear to me how global food systems that either deliver expensive imported food or ultra-processed food helps with food equity in urban spaces. Does it make more sense, as you indicate elsewhere, to foster more vibrant territorial food systems that can deliver healthy local food that supports both consumers and producers (e.g. Brazil and the popular markets and/or restaurants). Perhaps the last sentence in this section could be reconsidered.

In response to question 4:

Re section 4.5.1: There is some research from Quito that could be relevant here where a key point is the importance of UA for women. Findings are available at – https://www.foodsystemsjournal.org/index.php/fsj/article/view/727/720

And a practice-based report here: https://journals.openedition.org/factsreports/5641


62. Sector Project Food and Nutrition Security, GIZ - German Development Cooperation, Germany

The draft seems to provide a comprehensive insight into the discussion on urban and peri-urban food systems. The relevance of cross cutting issues such as gender, climate change and food loss and waste as well as circularity should be particularly highlighted.

A very important aspect is, that local and national policies are frequently considered separately, meaning that local decision-makers are not included in national consultations, although they often face identical challenges. Local structures, e.g. "food policy councils", offer a platform for exchange and could hence be strengthened. In these councils, local perspectives and voices of different stakeholder groups (marginalized groups, rural population, etc.) are heard and can subsequently be included in decision-making processes beyond local structures.

In order to facilitate the operationalisation of the report, the BMZ global project "Scaling digital agricultural innovations through start-ups" (SAIS) could serve as a project example (question 6). The project is implemented by GIZ (German Development Cooperation). The project supports the agtech start-up MyVarm in Egypt, which specialises in urban agriculture and offers hydroponic microkits for growing fresh produce. The innovative app offers technical support and connects users with consumers to sell or swap their harvest.
63. Anna Davies, Trinity College Dublin, Ireland

HLPF Consultation

Strengthening urban and peri-urban food systems to achieve food security and nutrition in the context of urbanization and rural transformation – V0 draft of the HLPE-FSN report #19

Response: Anna Davies, PhD, FTCD, MRIA, FISC

Introduction

This is a timely and comprehensive report addressing urgent issues. In particular flagging the importance of going beyond a supply-side focus which has dominated agri-food debates historically. Increasing the prominence of UPU landscapes will be crucial in any just transition to sustainable food systems. Usefully, it flags the internally and externally uneven power of urban areas to shape food systems. This nuanced reading of power and place is significant and welcome, both in relation to the differential power of urban governments in shaping urban food systems in different places and in terms of the differential power of particular constituents within a specific urban area. The report emphasises the role of spatial planning, provision of basic infrastructural services, environmental health policies and local economic development policy, in shaping UPU food security and food systems, and makes the important point that these practices are rarely acknowledged as food policy but should be. The report also recognises that attending to food availability and economic accessibility are necessary, but alone insufficient to ensure urban food security and nutrition, and that food systems designed to meet this need alone are damaging human and planetary health. However, while the inclusion of food security is hugely welcome, the report could do with more attention to the non-human elements and how these affect food security and nutrition, such as biodiversity and climate change.

In this response to the Zero Draft I provide below comments on the pre-set questions and following this additional commentary of selected sections of the report. These are intended to strengthen the report and I hope these are useful in future iterations.

1. Do you find the proposed framework effective to highlight and discuss the key issues concerning urban and peri-urban food systems? Is this a useful conceptual framework to provide practical guidance for policymakers? Can you offer suggestions for examples to illustrate and facilitate the operationalization of the conceptual framework to address issues relevant for FSN?

The framework provides an effective means of organising the key issues which are complex and interconnected. At present guidance is high level so is likely to be of limited practical help for policy makers on a day-to-day scale, but it is impossible to provide practical guidance at this level in a global study due to the significance of historical, cultural, economic, regulatory, social and other factors. Contexts in which interventions (such as new policy developments, reconfiguration of policy etc.) are made are also constantly evolving. One size will not fit all. Even once developed with context in mind an intervention will need to be further adapted to ever changing contexts. I do not have any examples where the proposed conceptual framework has been operationalised in toto. I would be surprised if any exist given the fragmented nature of UPU food governance.
2. The report adopts the broader definition of food security (proposed by the HLPE-FSN in 2020), which includes six dimensions of food security: availability, access, utilization, stability, agency and sustainability. Does the V0 draft cover sufficiently the implications of this broader definition in urban and peri-urban food systems?

This broader definition is important and usefully articulated in the report. There is considerable material presented around some dimensions (e.g. availability, access), less in relation to sustainability, which itself has multiple dimensions. Expanding and strengthening attention to sustainability dimensions would be useful, particularly in relation to climate change and biodiversity components and perhaps also care and wellbeing.

3. Are the trends/variables/elements identified in the draft report the key ones to strengthen urban and peri-urban food systems? If not, which other elements should be considered? Are there any other issues concerning urban and peri-urban food systems that have not been sufficiently covered in the draft report? Are topics under- or over-represented in relation to their importance?

The report is extremely thorough in mapping existing data around many trends/variables/elements. I'm not sure there is anything ‘missing’ per se. However, the overall impression is that elements/initiatives/alternative approaches are evaluated against their success to date within the current (e.g. unsustainable) system. There is the danger then of unintended consequences which may dismiss currently niche, small-scale, emergent, novel, non-mainstream activities because of their limited success to date, within this flawed system. The report indicates limitations of some emergent and alternative mechanisms but these limitations arise from within an unreconstructed and unsustainable urban food system context – as a result it is unsurprising that they do not fair well. This should not be a reason to discount them when transitioning to more sustainable food systems where their full impact and value (e.g. beyond financial value) may be better recognised.

The report is primarily focused on lower income contexts, which is well-justified in terms of pressures around food security and nutrition but this focus may miss opportunities for highlighting alternative possibilities.

The following issues are mentioned in passing, but remain under-developed compared to other elements. This may be because data is missing, unavailable, incomparable however it is possible to use this report to call for more and better data around key elements such as:

- **Co-benefits around food systems transformation relating to biodiversity and Nature-Based Solutions (NbS) for climate change adaptation**
- **Attention to technology** beyond that used for improving food production and commercial distribution logistics. For example, information and communications technologies which are increasingly widely adopted in global north and south for connecting people and organisations e.g. FoodCloud foodiverse platform pilot studies in technology-led solution to food waste reduction in Nigeria, Kenya, Ethiopia and Ghana through food redistribution via food banks.

Platform economies are more than just online food delivery platforms, they support a host of...
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activities, tools and services across the food system from social dining (e.g. EatWith) through to urban harvesting.

- **Just transitions** - It is great to see power given a high profile in the document. However, more could have been said about just transitions, and in particular inclusive participation and engagement with diverse publics around UPU food systems in terms of influence and development planning (e.g. fairer futuring). More explicit attention to how food security relates to food justice and sovereignty (perhaps around seed sovereignty) could also strengthen discussions around just transitions to sustainability.

- **Non-commercial food activities** – given the dominance of capitalist approaches to food it is unsurprising to find the bulk of data in the report relates to these kinds of activities. However, the report also seems to equate commercial with formal and everything else as informal which is too blunt and is in danger of missing an important and potentially transformative set of activities as a result. Here activities would include grassroots, community-based collective actions around food such as community gardens, community seed banks, community kitchens, community-based surplus food redistribution activities (sometimes termed food sharing as an umbrella category). The landscape and impacts of such activities globally has not been established, explaining why attention to this group of activities taken collectively (e.g. as a sector) is relatively under-developed in the report. Nonetheless there are emergent projects which are beginning to map and assess the sustainability impacts of this sector in the UPU setting e.g. Horizon Europe Innovation Action **CULTIVATE** (focused on European UPU food sharing). Previous research e.g. **SHARECITY**, identified the existence of such activities across every continent using digital traces which itself would under report the actual scale and scope of activities. Additionally, the power of UPU residents should not be reduced to only shaping demand for commercial food products and services, they can also be agents for growing food individually (home gardening, allotments etc.) or collectively (e.g. community gardens, co-ops, etc.) and redistributing food.

4. Is there additional quantitative or qualitative data that should be included? Are there other references, publications, or traditional or different kind of knowledges, which should be considered?

**This Handbook provides comprehensive coverage of a range of urban food governance dimensions including sections on history, practices, theories and futures:**


**Relating to matters of public participation and futuring around urban food (mentioned in point 3 above):**


**Relating to non-commercial UPU food initiatives (mentioned in point 3 above):**


**Relating to use of ICT/platform economies in UPU food systems (mentioned in point 3 above):**


5. Are there any redundant facts or statements that could be eliminated from the V0 draft?

No, although the extent of historical context could be revisited and the writing tightened with each chapter having a summary of key points upfront in each perhaps.
6. Could you suggest case studies and success stories from countries that were able to strengthen urban and peri-urban food systems? In particular, the HLPE-FSN would seek contributions on:

a) evidence-based examples of successful interventions in urban and peri-urban food systems with the principles behind what made the process work;

b) efforts made to enhance agency in urban and peri-urban food systems;

c) efforts made to enhance the right to food in urban and peri-urban settings;

d) examples of circular economy and urban and peri-urban food system and climate change adaptation and mitigation, preferably beyond issues of production; and

e) examples of national and local government collaboration on urban and peri-urban food systems.

Really need to define what is meant by ‘success’ here and the kind of metrics could be used. Many of the references to non-commercial initiatives listed above might be considered successful in non-financial sustainability terms (e.g. social, educational, environmental etc.). Other ‘successful’ initiatives might have been negatively affected by shifting or uneven power relations within particular areas, so their success or failure may not be related to their impacts or potential but other exogenous issues due to wider politics and conditions.

Comments below are made on a chapter by chapter basis:

Introduction

Some of these are visible in key message Sec 1 but deserve greater attention in the body of the document.

- This ‘urbanization of poverty’ becomes food insecurity as the urban poor spend a large amount of their income on food and bear the cost of urban living.
- Urban and peri-urban food systems have historically been oriented towards meeting availability and affordability of foods for urban populations. Urban and peri-urban food systems are currently unsustainable, unjust, nutritionally unbalanced, and prone to shocks.
- As much as there are challenges, urbanization also provides opportunities for livelihoods, improved diets and increased agency.

Tension in Key Messages

- Urban and peri-urban food systems have historically been oriented towards meeting availability and affordability of foods for urban populations. Urban and peri-urban food systems are currently unsustainable, unjust, nutritionally unbalanced, and prone to shocks.
There is an urgent need for interventions to strengthen food security and nutrition within urban and peri-urban food systems and reorient them to improve access and diet quality. Interventions should be guided by an understanding of the interactions between food security and nutrition, food systems, governance processes, and urbanization.

The above two key messages seem to be in slight tension – the first identifies the historical focus and identifies the limitations of this approach. The second still focuses on access with the added ‘quality’ however without explicitly recognising uneven patterns of power and agency within UPU areas this is unlikely to transform many of the current limitations.

Section 1.1

Many future urban residents, predominantly in Africa and Asia, will be living in cities and peri-urban areas as yet unbuilt. The decisions made around urban food systems and urban development today lock in path dependencies that shape food security trajectories for future generations (Pieterse et al., 2018).

This is a key point which relates to governance processes and uneven participation in and influence on planning developments around food and urban spaces. Processes of ‘fairer futuring’ (Fitzgerald & Davies, 2022) are required.

Sec 1.3.2

The stability dimension in urban areas needs to extend beyond considering the stable supply of foods and stable food prices, to consider the broader challenges of instability of livelihoods and employment and political instability that are often associated with U-PU areas.

Also important to recognise climate instability and impacts of biodiversity loss on stability in relation to FSN

Agency is closely associated with the Right to Food.

This needs unpacking further to articulate how exactly agency is related to the Right to Food. This is unclear at present.

The proximity of urban and peri-urban residents to the local state provides opportunities to exercise agency in food systems governance

This is a substantial assumption made without reference to evidence. Proximity does not necessarily equate to the ability to exercise agency. Reference to evidence should be added to create a more robust argument here.

Within the U-PU FSN it is essential to consider sustainability beyond sustainable production, but to link it to sustainable consumption and examine how unsustainable practices across food systems, urban systems and related systems interact to shape FSN outcomes
This is essential in UPU areas but also beyond them

Explicit mention should be made here about matters of food waste and surplus food redistribution which reside outside production and consumption. Indeed, reference to circular food systems, regenerative production, reuse, food sharing would be beneficial here, recognising how they can support greater resilience in UPU areas.

Chapter 2

Important to mention intersectional inequalities

Chapter 3

Check referencing to Figures in this chapter e.g. 3.1 and 3.3

3.4.1

The use of the term “Food choice” can be problematic if it is reduced to the ABC model (attitudes lead to behaviours which ultimately lead to choices) of behaviour change.

More could be added around food culture to this section and to move beyond simple agency-structure dualism as this can be misinterpreted in particular with respect to relationality.

What about food sovereignty? While 90% of food is purchased in urban areas it is worth questioning whether more should be done to support growing within urban areas.

Worth referencing community/grassroot-led food initiatives such as those collated under urban food sharing initiatives by Davies (2019) in terms of fostering food resilience in UPU in terms of production, consumption, surplus food redistribution and food waste management. There is an example given termed ‘Self-help groups’ that have been shown to provide food security resilience in rural India (Demont, 2022).

Chapter 4

4.3.1

Waste management should also be addressed with better coordination with food banks – although this approach has been frequently critiqued (e.g. Riches, 2018) the use of technological applications for data management, and the transformation of such waste into animal feed (UNEP DTU Partnership and United Nations Environment Programme, 2021; Latka et al., 2022; FAO, 2011).

Edible surplus food need not only be redistributed to ‘food banks’

Chapter 5

5.2
Power – what about power by inaction? This might be due to lack of will, resources for implementation, monitoring etc.

5.3.2

In fact, urban dwellers are often important partners, developing diverse activities as citizens which include for example participation in the development or implementation of urban food policies and the development of grass-root initiatives in the food realm from urban gardens to surplus food redistribution

- This is an important point but there is no evidence provided to back it up. There are many publications illustrating this, albeit primarily examining higher income cities (Davies et al., 2017; Davies 2019)

5.4.3

...there remains insufficient evidence about whether these innovations make a difference and how. For example, both New York City and Brighton (UK) have been viewed as pioneers in urban food policy innovations and yet, their indicators on urban food security and nutrition have not substantially improved. This either suggests that such innovations have been divorced from other binding constraints to transforming urban food systems or that such innovations might not have had sufficient time to demonstrate impact. Learning from deviant cases—ones where the outcome contradicts the original expectation—is key to help advance thinking about whether and how multistakeholder and multi-sectoral approaches concretely affect food and nutrition outcomes

- There is an assumption in this paragraph that a lack of evidence suggests a lack of impact. While this might be the case, it is impossible to know what their food security and nutrition rates would have been if those innovations hadn’t taken place. The existence of a policy council does not mean that the policy council is itself powerful within the governing architecture.

Chapter 6

6.2.2

...developing inclusive participatory processes that embed anticipatory governance into planning exercises

- This is what to do, but actors /institutions need information on how to do this? See Fitzgerald and Davies (2022)

...there is a need to understand better the different powers at play and how they can be leveraged to strengthen urban food systems and deliver food and nutrition security

- Again an admirable principle but guidance on how to do this and how to leverage is needed
... Just as important as the quality of public service is uneven strength and activities of civil society

- This is important but not really reflected in preceding chapters. The document could do with more evidence around civil society activities around food e.g. (Davies, 2019)

... paramount to fund a dedicated food team

- Again providing guidance on how to do this would be helpful in locations where they don't exist and there's no food policy council etc.

6.5.3

There are also self-organised and autonomous initiatives addressing inequalities and redistributing resources to strengthen urban and peri-urban food and nutrition security. These different forms of collective action can take many different forms and coalesce around a variety of projects, from seed swaps to community fridges or collective kitchens.

- This statement deserves evidencing e.g. Marovelli (2019); Weymes and Davies (2019); Davies (2019); Davies et al (2022); Davies et al (2019); Morrow and Davies (2022)

6.5.6

Reference is made to behaviour change interventions but without evidence of impact being provided. These should be added. Also deserves some comment on the assumptions within these behaviour change interventions which predominantly lie in the information deficit model of change which has been demonstrated to have limited impact when focused on individuals and in the absence of consideration of wider factors affecting practices.

64. Rajiv Mehta, FAO, India

With compliments to HLPE-FSN team for drafting the complexity of urban and peri-urban food systems and food security in the context of urbanization and rural transformation, following points are offered:

1. Conceptual framework

- The food systems evolve and coexist with typologies of human settlements. The urbanization is a continual process of human settlement transformation, taking place in diverse typologies of changes in dominant occupations, lifestyle, culture and behavior, and thus altering the demographic and social structure of both urban and rural areas (World Urbanization Prospects: United Nations, 2018), and the food system transformation is corollary to it. This phenomenon of demographic shift, primarily triggered by combinations of social and economic
pull and push factors at different period of time; leaves options and / or choice for the people to adjust in lifestyle, including food. A small section on this process can be considered.

3. trends/variables/elements identified in the draft report

- The challenges and opportunities for the food security with sustainable food system (Table 4.1) may not be generalized for urbanization per say but may be contextual to corresponding distinct food systems and individuals. The territorial markets may be less relevant to food importing countries, where trade assumes greater significance. Similarly, the single member working population, a pronounced urban phenomenon, would depend on different food system than normal households.
- The quest to enhance resilience of food security in urban context may anchor on positives of efficient market and supply chains, higher literacy and awareness, better social services and convenience of public interventions and distress mitigation, that get easily harnessed in urban food system. In some respect, the rural transformation is more guided by urban transformation and not vice versa, particularly in conditions of promotion of rural non farm employment, commercial farming and market oriented economy, seeking parity with urban lifestyle.
- The context of modern and traditional channels in retail sector (Fig 4.2) possibly has got disrupted due to spurt in digital payment system during COVID and rapidly increasing digital connectivity across the continents. Now the analytical studies on household spending using digital payments reflect emerging trends of consumer behavior. The solutions for resilience of food security may possibly also account these trends and technological currents, getting stronger in coming future.

Rajiv Mehta, Senior Statistician, FAO, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

65. Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries JAPAN, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, Japan

Dear HLPE-FSN team,

Congratulations on this first draft. Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments. Please see the comments from the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries below.

Regarding p3, “focuses on the production of staples, on large scale production, on reliance on imports of cheap staples, on the marginalization of small scale and informal actors,” these situations can also be seen in developed countries, where food self-sufficiency rate is low, in addition, the rural economy is declining and reducing and aging population is advancing. In order to develop whole national land in well balanced manner, it is necessary to utilize domestic agricultural resources and focus on sustainable and productive agriculture, considering using various types of innovation.
34. Jess Halliday, RUAF, United Kingdom

Congratulations on a very good and detailed zero draft. The following comments are on behalf of the RUAF Global Partnership on Sustainable Urban Agriculture and Food Systems.

In response to Q1s and Q2 (conceptual framework and dimensions of food security)

1. We find the conceptual framework and broader definition of FSN to be very useful and effective. However, as is rightly asked, the practical guidance of working with all elements, system principles and directions will require a lot of effort and good examples. This includes references to existing work of cities (MUFPP), on multi actor initiatives (councils, food labs), existing depositories (including RUAF, FoodActionCities, etc.).

2. Others have noted that the report is very SDG2 centric. While this is understandable given the CFS brief, it should be clear that FSN is the end-game and other outcomes of the food system – such as economic development and livelihoods, and climate resilience – ultimately impact FSN. As such, it is important for policy makers to carefully examine all potential trade-offs of a proposed intervention. For example, it is rightly stated to extend the right to food to other rights, including the right to City. This links directly to SDG 11, and others. Another example, an initiative to control food prices to support access to affordable food supports FSN for some, but may also impact the livelihood of some other actors, meaning they are more likely to experience poverty and food insecurity. Box 6.1 may be a good place to include this.

In response to Q3 (trends, variables, elements, issues):

1. There is considerable attention to ‘foodsheds’, yet this is a rather outmoded conceptualisation that represents cities as having an extractive relationship with surrounding rural areas that provide their food needs. More recent approaches to territorialisation and city region food systems understand that urban areas are embedded in their geographical and regional context, and there are multi-directional flows of people, goods, services, economic value and ecosystem services across the urban-rural continuum. This is important for ensuring that urban food systems both help meet the food needs of urban areas and promote rural development, including development of food system activities in smaller towns and secondary cities in the vicinity of a larger urban areas, and serving as a multifunctional level for change (as well as supporting FSN).

As well as, or instead of, the figure showing overlapping foodsheds, it may be useful to depict various different forms of ‘city region’, which ‘not only refers to megacities and the immediate rural and agricultural areas surrounding them, but also to small and medium-sized towns that link remote small-scale producers and their agricultural value chains to urban centres and markets. City regions can also be defined as a network of towns that collaborate within a territory over economic, social or environmental assets, interests and issues.’ (FAO, 2023, p. 5 – includes helpful diagram). The diversity of different types/characters of food territories around cities and towns of all sizes and configurations stands opposed to the apparent critique of various
programmes that support territorialisation (the City Region Food System Programme, the Urban Food Agenda, the Green Cities Initiative) as a ‘normative notion of a localised foodshed’ (p. 63).

Moreover, highlighting the localisation priority of the foodshed concept, whilst citing it as the inspiration behind other (more evolved) conceptualisations of territorialisation, risks tarring them all with a brush of ‘defensive localism’. For the city region food system approach, this is explicitly not the intention:

‘At its root, a city region food system approach proposes that we should work to strengthen and improve the quality of the connections between urban areas and their rural hinterlands and between consumers and nearby food producers, in order to realise a suite of social, economic and environmental benefits. However, it is not a case of unquestioning localism. Rather, it is about creating a framework for conscious food governance that takes territoriality into account, recognising that cities exist within a specific geography and that decisions about food operate across an urban-rural continuum. It recognises the central role of the private sector in the food system, but is based on the understanding that public goods will not be delivered by market forces alone, and that greater transparency and democratic participation are prerequisites. (Jennings et al. 2015: 28)

2. The inclusion of gender is very welcome (p. 26 and p68). It would be helpful to acknowledge that people of all genders can be impacted by gender-related inequalities – for example, men and boys may face inequalities in areas like educational attainment, dropout rates, criminal activities, violence, and employment. Men and boys are also critical to addressing gender issues facing women in the food system through a whole society approach to addressing cultural norms.

On p. 26, the discussion of gender is followed by a paragraph on intersectionality. It would be helpful to link these explicitly, to show that the lived experiences of people of different genders are impacted by other factors constituting their identity (e.g. race, class, ethnicity, education, etc). Please see RUAF, 2020.

3. There is no mention of the role of youth in urban food systems. As expressed in HLPE Report no. 16, 2021, it is imperative that initiatives to strengthen urban food systems actively engage youth, with young people playing a leadership role. This includes enabling youth participation in urban food systems governance, demonstrating economic opportunities for young people throughout the food system (where perceptions, particularly of farming, are negative), and addressing narratives that shape consumption preferences that favour ultra processed, ‘fast’ food and shun traditional diets. Failure to engage young people in the food system will have significant impacts on FSN in the future, with ageing farming populations and migration of youth to cities in search of non-farming livelihoods – alongside rapidly growing urban populations requiring food.
4. The HLPE-FSN 0-draft Report does not cover at all or adequately cover the following topics related to UPA:

It does not cover Circular Economy and safe wastewater reuse in urban and peri-urban areas. If you search for wastewater in the doc, almost all the hits are in the reference section. UPA thrives on resources that can be easily recovered in safe ways to close multiple nutrient and water loops.

It does not adequately cover issues around food safety of UPA products. There is a section/subsection 4.5.1.2 on Food Safety concerns but the section can be expanded to cover all aspects of safety concerns.

Issues on food nutrition come with quality of UPA products at harvest and post-harvest. This means that urban and peri-urban areas’ capacity to store products to maintain nutritional value/quality is of utmost importance. This must be addressed as urbanisation increases and cities become bigger.

5. With regard to embedding food strategies and overcoming electoral change, the paragraph on page 79 suggests that, if the right lessons are learned, ‘backtracking’ following political shifts can be avoided. This may be so, but there are also examples where food systems work has been embedded into the municipality for decades, yet still is disrupted by political change. Toronto is a clear example.

6. Warnings against uncritically importing food systems work from the Global North to the Global South due to contextual specificities are very important (p. 83). It would be helpful to go further and note that direct transfer between contexts – often also between two cities in the Global North – is not always possible because of different context and governance conditions. Thus, deep understanding of context is vital, as well as what can be done, and how to adapt examples from elsewhere.

In response to question 5 (case studies)

The zero draft already contains a lot of useful case studies, drawing on existing repositories. However, we note that some are out of date, or the situation has moved on. An example is Bristol, where the food policy council no longer meets but the food governance continues through other platforms (Joy Carey can provide more details on this).

Rather than a general request for more case studies, which may quickly become overwhelming, it may be helpful to identify precise areas where examples are needed.
Other

The language of the report is highly academic. Care should be taken to ensure it is accessible to the target readership, who are unlikely to be food system experts. In the same vein, the institutional enablers and the policy instruments must set out a very clear ask. They currently feel tagged on to a rather academic report, and while they give valuable – if brief – suggestions of what many help, readers may be left wondering how to go about it / where to start. An expanded ‘how’ section could be helpful, or supplementary accessible and practical guidance.

References:


35. Julio Prudencio, Investigador independiente afiliado a la Fundación TIERRA y al Instituto de Investigaciones Socioeconómicas de la Universidad Católica de Bolivia, Bolivia (Plurinational State of)

1. Respecto a la Concepción:

Hay que adoptar una perspectiva territorial (Inclusive transfronteriza, entre países) en la que el Medio Ambiente desempeñe un papel clave tanto para las áreas urbanas/ciudades como para las rurales.

2. Respecto a las dimensiones de la seguridad alimentaria.

Para mí, han incorporado un enfoque nuevo que no tiene un justificativo apropiado. Habría que trabajar y justificar más profundamente en lo ya establecido hace tiempo; y que los actores del desarrollo utilicen esos enfoques, y no aumentarles/presionarlos para que adopten nuevos enfoques.

3. Cuestiones que merecen más atención en el borrador del Informe:
Plantear aspectos específicos para que el Derecho Humano a la Alimentación Adecuada sea cumplido por todos los países, estableciendo sanciones para el país que no cumpla con ese Derecho.

Hay países que han firmado el Derecho Humano a la Alimentación, pero no lo cumplen. Inclusivo, políticamente han tomado la decisión de sitiar/cercar (2 veces) ciudades capitales importantes, para que su población no reciba alimentos, para que la población no se abastezca, violando así el DHA.

La biodiversidad, que es la base de los alimentos, fundamental en la seguridad alimentaria. La biodiversidad no es valorada en su verdadera dimensión por lo que el Informe debe prestar mayor atención a ésta, y plantear más recomendaciones.

La creciente desigualdad socioeconómica que cada vez se amplía más y más en todas las poblaciones (urbanas e inclusive rurales), lo que determina una demanda y consumo diferente de alimentos, siendo desplazados los alimentos tradicionales ricos en calorías y proteínas por los alimentos precocidos, los fritos, las gaseosas y otros.

El cambio climático es fundamental de abordarlo desde la perspectiva del desarrollo sostenible, de la seguridad alimentaria nutricional, del resguardo de la biodiversidad.

Por eso, los modelos de desarrollo de fomento a las exportaciones de productos agrícolas (soya, caña de azúcar, etc), por ampliar la frontera agrícola para el fomento de esas exportaciones, están deforestando, quemando la amazonía, matando la biodiversidad, y fomentando el monocultivo y no la diversificación productiva. Ese modelo de fomento a las exportaciones es extractivo y debe ser parado por el logro de una seguridad alimentaria nutricional, diversificada, con alimentos sanos, con soberanía.

Hace años que se plantea la Agricultura Urbana como una alternativa más para abastecer de alimentos a las poblaciones urbanas, pero las políticas públicas no han dado el apoyo suficiente en términos de decisión política y apoyo económico; y menos atención aún en términos de capacitación, supervisión, semillas, etc.

En el Informe borrador no hay suficiente atención a las Estrategias de Sobrevivencia alimentaria que las poblaciones urbanas de escasos recursos implementan, como el intercambio de productos procesados (urbanos como el aceite) con los productos de consumo directo (papa, oca, etc) que poseen sus familiares en el sector rural; ni tampoco la asistencia en los comedores populares, la participación de mujeres en organizaciones sociopolíticas para obtener alimentos; ni los subsidios alimentarios (prestaciones sociales) entre otros.
36. Helen Onyeaka, University of Birmingham, United Kingdom

As a food microbiologist, I commend the HLPE-FSN for their comprehensive approach towards addressing urban and peri-urban food systems in the context of urbanization and rural transformation. The V0 draft presents a thoughtful conceptual framework, but there are areas where further refinement and inclusion of specific elements could enhance its effectiveness.

1. Conceptual Framework Effectiveness: The framework effectively highlights key issues, yet it could benefit from a stronger emphasis on the role of microbiology in ensuring food safety and quality. This aspect is crucial in urban settings where food supply chains are longer and more complex.

2. Trends/Variables/Elements in Urban Food Systems: While the draft addresses many key elements, it may underrepresent the significance of emerging food technologies like vertical farming. These technologies are particularly relevant for space-constrained urban areas and can contribute significantly to sustainability and food security.

3. Additional Data: The draft could benefit from more case studies focusing on the microbiological aspects of food safety in urban settings. Quantitative data on foodborne illnesses and the effectiveness of various food safety protocols in urban areas would be valuable.

4. Redundant Facts or Statements: It's important to streamline the content to avoid redundancy, especially in the sections discussing general principles of food security which might already be well understood by the target audience.

5. Case Studies and Success Stories: The inclusion of success stories from cities that have effectively integrated microbiological techniques in food safety management would be beneficial. For example, cities that have employed innovative waste recycling methods or urban farming practices that utilize beneficial microbes for improved yield and sustainability.

Overall, the V0 draft is a strong starting point, but incorporating more specific examples and data related to the microbiological aspects of food security in urban settings would make the recommendations more robust and actionable.

37. Institute of Food Technologists, Institute of Food Technologists, United States of America

Please see the comments from the Institute of Food Technologists. Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments.

Dear HLPE-FSN,
The Institute of Food Technologists (IFT) appreciates the opportunity to provide input to the V0 draft of the HLPE-FSN report on “Strengthening urban and peri-urban food systems to achieve food security and nutrition in the context of urbanization and rural transformation.” IFT is a global organization of approximately 12,000 individual members, in 95 countries, who are committed to advancing the science of food. We believe that science is essential to ensuring that our global food system is sustainable, safe, nutritious, and accessible to all. For this reason, we are encouraged to see this report addressing food and nutrition security in urban and peri-urban areas.

In reviewing the V0 draft, IFT is encouraged to see the emphasis on food safety, as well as affordability and accessibility to nutritious foods. We further recommend a deeper look at how food science & technology can be part of the solution in achieving food and nutrition security in urban and peri-urban settings. As an example, food science and technology has made significant contributions in increasing the availability of food around the world through packaging and processing technologies that allow foods to be safe and stable for longer periods of time. The report acknowledges food processing can improve food safety, and consumers recognize this, but this is primarily positioned as a disadvantage for healthy diets as it is assumed all processed foods are of poorer nutritional quality than fresh foods. However, this is not always the case as there are many processed foods that provide important nutrition, particularly for urban and peri-urban populations who struggle with “time poverty” as noted in the report. IFT encourages the HLPE to take a more balanced view of the role of processed foods in enabling food and nutrition security and identify the strengths that should be built on while examining how to overcome identified weaknesses. Several recent publications (provided in the reference section) provide additional information and case studies on how sustainable production of nutritious foods with processing technology can help improve food and nutrition security around the globe. We suggest a recommendation for more investments from the public and private sectors in research and development of technologies to make food safe with a focus on preserving nutrient content by minimizing the use of heat, chemicals, or water and reducing food components/nutrients to limit (e.g., saturated fat, added sugars, sodium). This would improve food safety, nutritional value, and sustainability.

Also, although fresh foods from informal markets are identified as the major source of foodborne disease, particularly in children, we agree that the responsibility for food safety extends beyond the vendors to all of the food system. For example, environmental contaminants, which are more frequently found in fresh foods in LMICs, are frequently a result of inadequate agricultural practices, such as the use of contaminated water. Thus, a multisector approach, including downstream and upstream players in the food system must be taken to ensure food safety.

We would also like to bring to the attention of the HLPE a case study from Chicago that is designed to bring affordable fresh produce to urban institutional settings, such as schools, health clinics, and community centers. The Fresh Moves Mobile Market is a win-win for urban farmers and low-income inner-city residents with limited access to fresh produce. The Urban Grower’s Collective converted a bus into a mobile farmer’s market that included fresh produce and some pantry staples, such as pasta, beans, coffee, and bread. The bus transports produce grown by urban farmers into areas of Chicago with limited access to fresh foods. The food is priced affordably and provides a fair price for the farmers. Examples
such as this could help address the transportation issues noted throughout the report by bringing the foods to the areas of greatest need as well as provide a means of income for urban farmers.

IFT believes the science of food and application of technology are important for transforming the food system to ensure food and nutrition security for all. Food scientists and technologists share a commitment with the HLPE-FSN and the CFS to improve nutrition and food security globally. We hope the HLPE will consider our comments to continue to support investment and advances in food science & technology to improve food and nutrition security for all. Please contact Anna Rosales, Senior Director Government Affairs and Nutrition (arosales@ift.org) if IFT may be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

Anna Rosales
Senior Director Nutrition and Government Affairs, Institute of Food Technologists
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See the attachments:

- Final Comments for V0 Draft of HLPE-FSN report on Urban and Peri-urban food systems.pdf
Congratulations to the team on a detailed report that presents the core concepts, framework and pathways to change with clarity and coherence. My comments on the zero draft can be found below.

Thank you and all the best,

Emily

1. The V0 draft introduces a conceptual framework informed by key principles established in previous HLPE-FSN reports (HLPE, 2017; HLPE, 2020).

   - Do you find the proposed framework effective to highlight and discuss the key issues concerning urban and peri-urban food systems?
   - Is this a useful conceptual framework to provide practical guidance for policymakers?
   - Can you offer suggestions for examples to illustrate and facilitate the operationalization of the conceptual framework to address issues relevant for FSN?

The conceptual framework provides a clear way of thinking about urban food systems and the myriad of challenges and complexities that they face. However, the report doesn't push it much further than that, making it difficult for a practitioner to operationalize, especially because the report emphasizes the heterogeneity of urban food systems. In order to bridge the gap, it might be useful to consider including:

   (i) indicators for practitioners to use to measure and monitor a food system or designing a project intervention; or
   (ii) a handbook of sorts (similar to ICLEIs) of which stakeholders to involve, what methods should be used to contextualize an urban food system, etc.; or
   (iii) a way in which policymakers and practitioners could prioritize investments and project interventions. Another possibility could be to include a compendium of case studies from which practitioners and policymakers could draw inspiration (similar to the FAO CSA Handbook).

2. The report adopts the broader definition of food security (proposed by the HLPE-FSN in 2020), which includes six dimensions of food security: availability, access, utilization, stability, agency and sustainability.

   - Does the V0 draft cover sufficiently the implications of this broader definition in urban and peri-urban food systems?

The report doesn't delve as deep into the unique environmental aspects of urban food production, which weakens the argument for the inclusion of the ‘sustainability’ dimension. The authors could consider including more details on how urban crop and livestock production (through traditional means and newer technological ones) affect the local environment in terms of soil health, water quality, biodiversity, energy use and fertilizers/compost. Might be useful to consider a section on urban forests, as well. The inclusion of this information would help to strengthen the sustainability dimension.

The report has a lot of rich information on urban nutrition outcomes, but it doesn't seem linked to the food security outcomes; they come across as separate rather than interlinked. Certain elements of urban
food security could be covered in more detail, particularly market dependence/reliance and transport needs (and associated fuel costs). It would also be interesting to include (if available) more information on chronic vs acute food insecurity in urban centers in the Global South. Are there likely to be more food crises located in urban centers in the future? How will conflict affect food security outcomes in urban areas? It may be worth reaching out to colleagues in FSIN (based in WFP) and IPC (based in FAO) on this because they may have data on previous and/or current food crises in cities, such as the ongoing one in Port-au-Prince.

3. Are the trends/variables/elements identified in the draft report the key ones to strengthen urban and peri-urban food systems? If not, which other elements should be considered?

- Are there any other issues concerning urban and peri-urban food systems that have not been sufficiently covered in the draft report?
- Are topics under- or over-represented in relation to their importance?

See previous answers and in addition, the information presented on the spatial elements of urban food systems is important, but it could be teased out more in the report by discussing in more depth the historical lack of connection between urban planning and food system outcomes, as well as including recommendations for urban planners (as one of the practitioner groups). Pothukuchi and Kaufman (1999 & 2000) could me two useful sources.

4. Is there additional quantitative or qualitative data that should be included?

- Are there other references, publications, or traditional or different kind of knowledges, which should be considered?

I’m currently working on two articles – one is scoping review of circularity in urban food systems in the Global North and Global South, and the other is a framework for circularity in urban food systems. They may be useful in extending some of the arguments made in the report and would be happy to discuss further. However, I’m not sure if the publication timelines will align, as my articles won’t be published until later in 2024. I’m also conducting research on circularity in Medellin’s food system in the early spring of 2024 (in collaboration with the FAO in Colombia), and the results from that may make for a useful case study to include in the report.

5. Are there any redundant facts or statements that could be eliminated from the V0 draft?

6. Could you suggest case studies and success stories from countries that were able to strengthen urban and peri-urban food systems? In particular, the HLPE-FSN would seek contributions on:

- evidence-based examples of successful interventions in urban and peri-urban food systems with the principles behind what made the process work;
- efforts made to enhance agency in urban and peri-urban food systems;
- efforts made to enhance the right to food in urban and peri-urban settings;
• examples of circular economy and urban and peri-urban food system and climate change adaptation and mitigation, preferably beyond issues of production; and
• examples of national and local government collaboration on urban and peri-urban food systems.

See the attachments:

• HLPE-FSN V0_UFS Report_Olsson Comments.docx

39. Paul Rigterink, Potomac Technical Advisors, United States of America

In response to question 6a) evidence-based examples of successful interventions in urban and peri-urban food systems with the principles behind what made the process work;

Part 1 of Joe Studwells' book "How Asia Works" describes the policy decisions that China and other Asian countries implemented to solve their food security problem. The policies that Deng Xiaoping implemented to solve China's food security crisis are described here. [https://factsanddetails.com/china/cat2/sub7/item347.html](https://factsanddetails.com/china/cat2/sub7/item347.html)


40. Astrid Epp, Permanent Representation of the Federal Republic of Germany to the UN Organizations in Rome, Italy

Dear colleagues,

Please find the comments to the report attached from the Permanent Representation of the Federal Republic of Germany to the UN Organizations in Rome.

Astrid Epp

Alternate Permanent Representative

General remarks:
We thank the CFS and HLPE for submitting the V0 draft of the report “Strengthening urban and peri-urban food systems to achieve food security and nutrition in the context of urbanization and rural transformation” and for the possibility to provide input at an early stage.

We welcome that the CFS addresses the important issue of urban and peri-urban food systems, which is and will be increasingly a highly relevant topic and is deeply interconnected with the inequality workstream. In our view, it would be valuable to create topical synergies between these two workstreams.

As urbanization grows, it is essential to introduce human rights-based policies which addresses not only the availability and accessibility of food but cover also other relevant aspects, e.g. as nutritional balance and the cross-cutting issues of food safety, climate and biodiversity protection, to promote the transformation to sustainable and resilient food systems. This is all the more true against the background of multiple crises and conflicts to which urban and peri-urban food systems are particularly vulnerable.

The multi-stakeholder and multi-level approaches should therefore always also reflect the rural character and the production side.

Finally, we would like to draw your attention to the Global Forum for Food and Agriculture 2016 with the special focus on urbanization: GFFA_Kommunique_2016_EN.pdf (gffa-berlin.de)

Remarks on individual chapters of the Report

In our view, the chapters are well chosen and reflect adequately and effectively the focus areas of urban and peri-urban food systems. They provide the key facts and sound analysis. We would like to make the following suggestions:

Chapter 4:

- chapter 4 should be enriched with forest and forestry issues: In addition to the diverse tree fruits for nutrition, aspects such as the positive environmental impacts of trees and forests for food systems (water retention, cooling, soil protection, etc.) as well as extended nutritional contributions (foliage as animal feed, wood/charcoal as an energy source for food preparation, etc.) should be mentioned. A reference to corresponding FAO resolutions in the Forestry and Agriculture Committees to consider sustainable food systems and agroforestry more closely together in future could be added. Finally, peri-urban forest and tree-based food systems can serve to reduce the pressure of destruction on the still intact forests in areas further away from the city. Reference should be made to past discussions on the topic of food and forestry in the CFS.

- In Chapter 4.6.3., especially consumer food waste is highlighted. We suggest to take into account that consumer food waste refers to household food waste and food waste generated in the out-of-home catering (such as restaurants and communal catering like schools and canteens). The causes why food waste arises are complex and diverse. They (and suitable food
waste reduction measures) differ between both sectors. You also might bear in mind that other sectors’ actions generate food waste in urban and peri-urban food systems and have an impact on consumer food waste.

- chapter 4.6.4.: we would like to highlight not only particular points of vulnerability in food systems but also potential leverage points as well as develop approaches to enhance the systems’ resilience. See proposed wording p.68
- we would also like to highlight biodiversity-related aspects in this chapter. See proposed wording incl. references, p.59, p.62, p.68.

**case studies/success stories:**

a) evidence-based examples of successful interventions in urban and peri-urban food systems with the principles behind what made the process work:

- The German "AgroBioNet" project investigated how rural regions and companies can be economically successful with food from special or endangered varieties and breeds. They analyzed 21 practical examples, identified success factors and derived recommendations that can be transferred to similar projects (e.g. supermarkets who offer meat products from traditional and neglected breeds in the respective region of origin together with traders and farmers). The case studies, success factors and recommendations are presented in the final brochure *"Value creation with old varieties and old breeds"* efforts made to enhance agency in urban and peri-urban food systems;

- Concept of solidarity-based farming where food is no longer sold on the market, but flows into its own transparent economic cycle, which is co-organized and financed by the consumers. Specifically, this is an association of farms or markets with a group of private households. Based on the estimated annual costs of agricultural production, this group undertakes to pay a fixed (usually monthly) amount to the farm each year in advance. This enables the producers to devote themselves to good agricultural practice, to keep the soil fertile and to farm in line with demand, independently of market constraints. In return, the buyers receive the entire harvest and (if the farm produces it) processed products such as bread, cheese etc.. The personal relationship makes people aware of their mutual responsibility. Website (unfortunately, only available in German: [https://www.solidarische-landwirtschaft.org/das-konzept/was-ist-solawi](https://www.solidarische-landwirtschaft.org/das-konzept/was-ist-solawi)).

- Initiatives for a stronger “city-rural area-dialogue”, as e.g. food policy councils in many cities, which, starting from the urban centres, seek connections to the surrounding peri-urban producers.


d) examples of circular economy and urban and peri-urban food system and climate change adaptation and mitigation, preferably beyond issues of production

- Example of food sharing movement to reduce food waste with over 500,000 users in Germany, Austria, Switzerland and other European countries who campaign
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against the careless use of resources and for a sustainable food system through saving and distributing food locally in private households and businesses, engaging in dialogues with politicians and educating consumers as well as raising awareness (https://food-sharing.de/). Successful examples of urban farming exists for producing mushrooms on coffee grounds in urban areas in the Netherlands, Switzerland and Germany, closing nutrition cycles and reducing food waste (https://www.bzbasel.ch/basel/basel-stadt/gemuse-vom-dach-sind-von-gestern-jetzt-kommen-die-stadt-pilze-ld.1732437). Examples from England and Germany also show the use of food waste (toast ends or old bread) for producing beer (https://www.toastbrewing.com/about-us; https://www.geo.de/wissen/ernaehrung/brauereien-brauen-bier-aus-altem-brot-30606326.html).

e) examples of national and local government collaboration on urban and peri-urban food systems

- In many German States (Bundesländer), so-called organic model regions (Ökoland-bau-Modellregion) were funded. These can be mergers of city and district, several municipalities, but also individual districts. The aim of all organic model regions is to increase the proportion of organic land on the one hand and to be able to offer consumers more regional organic products on the other. The combination of regional added value and organic production is intended to increase the attractiveness and sustainability of rural areas.

See the attachments:

- GER overall comments on the V0 HLPE-FSN report
- GER comments in the V0 HLPE-FSN report

41. Uma Koirala

My thought on the above matter:

Current food system is not addressing the need of general people as well as the vulnerable one. Six dimensions of food security are getting weak during these days in urban and peri urban areas. Agencies (players within food system) are more attracted to handsome profit so they are attracted toward ready to eat factory food. Available, accessible and stability is mostly dependent on easy factory product foods however sustainability, stability and utilization are matters of concern as these factors are depend upon the production, price and health of the consumers. Major challenges for strengthening urban and peri urban food system are:

- More attraction to ready to eat food due to easy availability, low cost/cheep, low time consuming on preparation and strong advertisements of the products.
- Busy urban life
Increasing rate of urban poor
Presence of multinational companies with aggressive marketing strategies.
People have less attraction on labor intensive farm activities so are reluctant about nutritious food they used to produce.
Food system is yet to be inclusive and gender friendly.

42. Jemina Moeng, Department of Agriculture, Land Reform and Rural Development, South Africa

Input made by the Food Security team in the Department of Agriculture, Land Reform and Rural Development.

Introduction: Urbanisation is an inevitable trend seen across the world, and it could be lessened by providing adequate livelihood opportunities and public services for rural populations, and by collectively building resilient agricultural sector in the face of climate change.

Urban and peri-urban food systems could be improved by:

- Coordinating the role of different actors involved in governing urban food systems, this could be achieved by establishing the Food and Nutrition Security Councils that will stakeholders accountable.
- Peri-urban agriculture plays a role in generating food system conditions that can enhance food security thus the economy. However, this land is under considerable development pressure. It is therefore important for local government to pro-actively include food production and the food system in land-use decision making in order to strengthen urban and peri-urban food systems.
- Provision of adequate climate smart support and training to (peri-)urban farmers is also important in improving their production and they must be empowered with resources across the entire food systems' value chains.
- Facilitating rural transformation, inclusive, sustainable and competitive value chains can be achieved through improving the following:
  - Food and agricultural hubs in or near rural and peri-urban markets must be established to absorb the produce of household, smallholder and micro farmers and agribusinesses and agro-processors; and
  - Market stimulation for smallholder producers to participate in local value chains
  - Improved policy environment to enhance participation of small holder producers in local food value-chains.
Community land and water food administration systems must be established to facilitate equitable access to quality water, energy, infrastructure, food safety for rural and urban communities. Balance should be maintained between domestic production and food exports to strengthen the food system and its resilience; and Food system aggregators must be established in the villages, rural towns and townships to ensure sufficient throughput of the products and services from schools in the villages, community production centres, household and smallholder producers at the desired quality on a sustainable basis.

In conclusion:

- Transformation of the rural economy is essential for growth, poverty reduction, employment creation and overcoming inequalities.
- Greater focus should on raising the productivity of smallholder producers as a way of increasing local access to nutritious foods.
- Focusing on local value food chains increases employment opportunities and reduces dependence on imports and migration to urban areas for job opportunities.

See the attachments:

- Strengthening urban and peri-urban food systems.docx

43. ANDRE GILLES MACHE, University of Bamenda-Camerroon / Department of biochemistry, Cameroon

Congratulations for this first draft. It is very rich and insightful!

This topic is so complex that when reading this first draft, To this topical theme of general interest, you will find attached some summarized proposals for How to Strengthen urban and peri-urban food systems to ensure food security and nutrition in the context of urbanization and rural transformation?

The Strengthening urban and peri-urban food systems to ensure food security and nutrition in the context of urbanization and rural transformation, case of Cameroon, involves:

- Satisfying urban and peri-urban demand, which requires not only an increase in agricultural production, but also an increase in agricultural products sold per farmer, as well as the effectiveness of the transformation of all local products taken from the soil Cameroonian in rural and urban areas.
- The continuation of agricultural and financial assistance to vulnerable communities in Cameroon, while supporting livelihoods in order to increase food production and then strengthen their resilience in rural and urban areas.

- The establishment of a national file of players in the said sector available at the level of each district.

- The professionalization of the agricultural and poultry sector with the establishment of professional agricultural or poultry cards for players in this sector, issued by the competent authorities of each district, thus allowing them access to credit, subsidies, equipment and then to agricultural and poultry inputs and any other benefit linked to their function.

- The multiplication of training centers specializing in the production, processing and conservation of agricultural and livestock products into local finished products in each rural and urban area.

- The creation of specialized post-harvest centers and storage of finished products resulting from the processing of raw materials in the form of a national granary in each district.

- Redistribution and access to arable agricultural land to nearly 15 million Cameroonians individually or in groups, in each rural and urban area.

- Access to agricultural and poultry credits for nearly 15 million Cameroonians in the said sector from the national list of actors in this sector at the rural and urban level in order to make up for the economic losses linked to COVID-19.

- Access to agricultural and poultry inputs in each rural and urban area at 50% in the form of a subsidy and 50% in the form of credit.

- The creation and domiciliation of a bank or agricultural micro-finance specialized in each rural and urban area.

- The industrialization (conservation and/or transformation) of 90% of products from agriculture in each rural then urban area and 80% reserved directly for national urban consumption.

- The export of 10% of finished products from the 90% previously processed and the remaining 80% will be intended for the national urban market.

- The creation of subsidized urban supermarkets for the marketing of 80% of national agricultural and poultry products.

- The creation and increase of mixed operational monitoring and training teams including advisors in agriculture and/or livestock, marketing-commerce-sales, post-harvest, food technology, financial resources management, then in taxation with a view to assisting rural farmers and then increasing the production and marketing of agricultural and poultry products in urban areas.
See the attachments:

- How to Strengthen urban and peri-urban food systems to ensure food security and nutrition in the context of urbanization and rural transformation

44. James Kuhns, Toronto Metropolitan University, Canada

Comments of James Kuhns, and Dr. Fiona Wallace

Thank you for a very comprehensive draft on an important and fast-changing subject.

The proposed framework gives policymakers a good overview of the intersection of FSN and urban food systems. The report could have given more examples of how policymakers can operationalize the framework. Some of the visuals are a bit messy (differing font sizes, odd layout). Figure 1.4 comes across clearly but the area with the arrows is not well explained. Some more detail should be added to the report to explain this part of the framework.

Figure 1.1 is quite useful in illustrating how critical policy elements impact various dimensions of food security. The discussion on the implications of this definition is very brief. A clear explanation of the differences between Sustainability (regenerative) and Stability (diverse & resilient) would be helpful. Is not resiliency also a critical element of sustainability?

If sustainability is being included in a broader definition- it needs to be clearly defined as to what is in scope. Does it mean sustainability of the food supply or sustainability of the environment- a formal definition could be added to indicate what ‘sustainability’ means. On page 68- sustainability is glossed over compared to the other attributes – more detail is required.

Some issues I believe warrant more coverage in the report. Although gender is mentioned in a few places in the report, I think it could be given more prominence. Especially, if you link it with social justice, which is largely missing in the draft report.

Section 3.1 which covers land inequality makes a few mentions of Indigenous views on land. There are many different Indigenous views concerning land. Some revision would be helpful. Also, the section on disabilities seems glossed over. In many parts of Canada, those that are on fixed incomes because of a disability are among the most food insecure. There is plentiful data from developed countries available on this issue.

The social protection section (6.5.3) needs more emphasis. In parts of the Global North, it is a core driver of food security, and it is under emphasized compared to other sections. The statements on the right to food section is well done! Overall, data and knowledge seem underrepresented, as without that you
cannot get governments to do anything! The need for formal research, and funding for formal research needs more emphasizing.

Case studies to strengthen urban and peri-urban food systems

In 2021 Toronto (Canada), city council passed the Black Food Sovereignty Plan. The plan uses a human rights approach that recognizes the right to food, understands hunger as a problem of food governance, unequal distribution, and injustice.

The plan focuses on systems and is centred on the decision-making power of people to define how to access their culturally appropriate foods. Further, it puts local farmers and other food providers at the centre of the food system and highlights relationships between communities, nature, and sustainability. The plan can be seen as advancing The City of Toronto's strategies and commitments, for example, Prosperity TO: Toronto Poverty, and the Resilience Strategy, among many others.

The report is structured with 5 thematic pillars:

- Sustainable funding & community capacity
- Access to growing space
- Accessible infrastructure
- Black food hubs and cultural markets
- Culturally rooted community health & nutrition programs

The pillars are accompanied by 45 recommendations, many of which specifically address enhancing agency.

Best wishes,

James Kuhns MSc, Lecturer, Toronto Metropolitan University, Toronto, Canada

Fiona Wallace PhD, Nutrition Opportunities Worldwide, Toronto, Canada

---

45. Charlotte Flechet, Rikolto, Belgium

Dear authors and moderators,

First of all, congratulations on a fantastic and comprehensive report that sets out a compelling conceptual framework and strong key principles. Attached you will find Rikolto’s contribution to the consultation on the V0 draft of the HLPE-FSN report #19.
Our comments focus on several points which are detailed in the document attached:

- **Language**: we are concerned that the jargon and academic language used in the report may deter what we imagine to be its intended users (government representatives, practitioners, etc.) from engaging with it.

- **Operationalisation of the framework**: the report is very theory-heavy and we feel that it would be significantly more accessible if it included practical illustrations and examples of the concepts described. This is done in some sections but not everywhere. Chapter 6 on institutional & policy pathways is weaker compared to the rest of the report. We would like to see more recommendations on how to translate the theoretical suggestions into concrete actions on the ground.

- **Food systems approach and trade-offs**: we find that there is insufficient reference to the potential trade-offs and co-benefits with other food system outcome areas namely livelihoods, environmental sustainability and resilience (which was nevertheless addressed to some extent). This is particularly evident in the section on institutional and policy pathways, where several examples of policy instruments were considered only through the lens of food security and nutrition.

- **Foodsheds vs. territories**: the concept of foodshed encourages the reader to view production areas solely through the lens of their role in feeding cities which is limitative and carries an extractive connotation. The concepts of city-region food systems and food territories seem more appropriate.

- **Youth**: Youth-led movements, CSO initiatives, and SMEs play an important role in putting emerging issues at the forefront and innovating new ways to produce, distribute, process, and consume food in cities. We encourage the authors to acknowledge youth’s leadership in urban food system transformation and to highlight ways in which (local) governments can support them and harness their efforts.

- **The role of private sector, particularly SMEs**: the report doesn’t clearly articulate how governments can harness the financial and innovative potential of the private sector while protecting themselves from undue influence by corporate actors. As it stands, the private sector is largely absent from most of the report. We would like to see more examples of how governments can work with SMEs to increase the sustainability, efficiency, and resilience of urban and peri-urban food systems, for example through school feeding programmes, local food distribution platforms or the provision of services to smallholder producers and small-scale processors.

- **Interplay with export markets**: we believe that it would also be relevant to explore the interplay between export dynamics and urban food system dynamics, where export markets can provide incentives for the adoption of good and safe agricultural practices, while at the same time providing investments in infrastructure, service provision and capacity that could be used in support of better access to nutritious and safe food in urban food markets in a context of market segmentation by farmer organisations.

- **Case studies**: finally, we suggest two case studies for your consideration: one on the Good Food parliament in Mbale, Uganda, and one on the Superlist initiative in Belgium which aims to make healthy and sustainable food consumption an easier choice for citizens.
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We wish you all the best in finalising the report and look forward to reading the final version!

Charlotte Flechet on behalf of Rikolto's Good Food for Cities' team (https://www.rikolto.org/programmes/good-food-for-cities)

See the attachments (the document contents a graph):

- Rikolto's response to the V0 draft of the HLPE-FSN report no. 19

46. Paul Rigterink, Potomac Technical Advisors, United States of America

The FAO may want to consider promoting policies that improve the heirloom garden seed industry in most African countries. Only South Africa has a robust garden seed industry in Africa (see Livingseeds Heirloom Seed Co, for example). Other African countries have limited the production of open pollinated, non-hybrid non-GMO seeds. African countries have limited the use of heirloom garden seeds so that their use will not interfere with the commercial production of vegetables for the European market.

I suggest that the FAO recommend the use of Victory Gardens (over poverty) so that people in poverty can increase their food security. In particular, I suggest that the FAO recommend the use of the Three Sisters garden technique to increase food availability in African urban and peri-urban environments. Many African countries do not have the heirloom garden seeds typically used for a Three Sisters garden in the US (Kentucky Wonder and Lazy Housewife green pole bean seeds as well as Country Gentleman, Golden Bantam and Bloody Butcher sweet corn),

47. Nicole Paganini, TMG Research, Germany

Dear Moderator & Editors

Thank you for the opportunity to engage on this important topic. We have attached our comments alongside the relevant subsection.

See the attachments (Excel table in pdf format):

- HLPE-FSN Comments.pdf

Global Forum on Food Security and Nutrition www.fao.org/fsnforum
48. Victoria Sherwin, Incredible Edible Lambeth, United Kingdom

I represent Incredible Edible Lambeth, a grassroots food growing network in London. We are currently working to strengthen the policy environment for food growing in Lambeth, London, as part of a Right To Grow network and also as part of our local food partnership (Lambeth Food Partnership). Your report was very useful to help me understand the wider context and drivers for creating sustainable urban food environments.

Your analysis of urban and peri-urban food growing is accurate in identifying the factors that inhibit food growing in London - lack of policy support for food growing at local authority level, lack of joined up working between communities and statutory authorities and a lack of joined up working across council departments. In London there is also a lack of financial resources - people are managing projects on a shoestring with short term funding if any, and food growers are in competition with developers for secure access to land.

The factor that is missing from your report is the need to build community and human capacity for food growing. IEL supports 120 community groups that grow food on housing estates, streets, meanwhile spaces, schools etc. Community food growing relies on access to land and physical resources but it also relies on people as a key resource. Projects are led by residents, many of whom are people managing physical and mental health challenges, and who are non-traditional learners. They are often working alone or in a small group in a difficult environment where there are multiple challenges eg high levels of conflict, and they often face institutional barriers to food growing. They urgently need the following support: upskilling (including organisational skills such as fundraising, community engagement and governance), and they want a stronger connection to other growers and decision makers.

Thanks again for giving the opportunity to contribute to this work.

49. Gareth Haysom, University of Cape Town, South Africa

As an urban food systems researcher, and policy advisor, the opening chapter of CFS HLPE Report #19 offers what I believe to be critical insights and positions as these pertain to the work of the HLPE and the wider food and nutrition security challenges, notably that:

- The future of the world is urban; more than half of humanity now lives in cities. Much of the projected urban population growth is happening in the poorest parts of the world.
- This ‘urbanization of poverty’ becomes food insecurity as the urban poor spend a large amount of their income on food and bear the cost of urban living.
- The urban and peri-urban need to be understood as active agents in shaping food systems and FSN conditions.
These framing statements directly reflect evidence, and gaps in the current approaches to the wider FNS challenges, gaps that for the most part have not been adequately engaged and addressed within urban food governance, national food and nutrition policy responses, or despite emerging work, in global governance domains. These framing statements are further supported by the points that:

- As much as there are challenges, urbanization also provides opportunities for livelihoods, improved diets and increased agency.
- Urban and peri-urban food governance can be transformative of the wider food systems.

Seeing urbanization as an area of solution and a key site of “struggle” through which global, regional, and local FNS challenges can be addressed is profound, and again, a position that has been largely absent in global discourses. Incorporating the role that governance at the urban scale can play in FNS transformation also requires significant acknowledgement.

The importance of these framing positions is re-enforced by the very real challenge detailed in the report that “many future urban residents, predominantly in Africa and Asia, will be living in cities and peri-urban areas as yet unbuilt”. For researchers and policymakers working in Africa and Asia, this view resonates strongly and reflects the current position. The statement further highlights the critical need to avoid path dependencies that will result from the current infrastructure investment focus (and development) in these regions. The intersection between cities that are yet to be built, and the stated FNS challenges detailed in the Draft Report further highlights the need for active FNS engagement at the urban scale, specifically how concepts such as Food Environments, Food Deserts, Food Retail (formal and informal), are governed for urban and peri-urban food system outcomes. Other infrastructure factors, such as energy supply, energy use, WASH, transport, all being built now, will dominate how the food system of these emerging urban areas function. These factors present an interesting challenge for the wider urban framing.

There are arguably three urban contexts that impact, influence and dictate food system outcomes. The developed city, cities largely formed during the first urbanisation transition; cities at various scales of urbanisation, effectively cities that largely reflect the first urban transition, but also reflect elements of the second urban transition; and then the sites of significant change and rapid, and very different urbanisation, cities and regions experiencing the second urban transition.

Given these differences and the need that these variations in urbanisation present, it is suggested that more attention is given to the second urban transition taking place in the Global South. I do need to acknowledge my own bias as a researcher from this context.

Chapter 2 – Urbanisation.

While I appreciate the need for brevity and that the work engaging the urban transitions are too vast and detailed for inclusion here, I do feel that there are four overarching urban considerations that are needed to ground this report in a specific urban context. Many of these have been named or inferred in Chapter 1. However, the different scales of urbanisation across regions and in countries, needs recognition and detail.
1) A key challenge in framing a global position is to avoid the instinct to generalise. This point is highlighted by the point noted in Ch1 on the pace and scale of urbanisation in two specific regions, SSA and South Asia.

2) Importantly, the work of Pieterse, Parnell, Oldfield, Siame, Watson, Simone, Revi, Bhan and many other Southern authors have made it plain that the urbanisation in the Global South differs significantly from that of the earlier urbanisation transition in the Global North. The current, largely Southern, urban transition has been referred to as the “second urban transition”. The “first” transition included a number of factors engaged in this chapter, specifically increased income, employment, and wellbeing. The first urban transition occurred at the same time as industrialisation, enabling significant infrastructure investment, employment and wealth generation. While the inequities associated with the first transition did exist, the general trend was one of industrial opportunity, economic benefit and the realisation of the so-called urban dividend. The second urban transition is taking place in in the context of a largely absent industrial transition, a global economy that is largely service (and thus highly skilled) oriented, and a globalised economy. Governance and developmental assets, specifically infrastructure, social services and income, came with the first urban transition, the benefit from an "urban advantage". The urbanisation that is currently taking place is taking place in much of the global South it taking lace in the context of an absent economy, a largely absent state, limited employment, reduced public services, and virtually no infrastructure investment. Southern urban residents able to counter these trends are often ensconced in elite estates, splintered from the urban majority. As a result, the second urban transition is symptomatic of high levels of informality, in terms of physical infrastructure and housing, economy and governance, and significantly limited fiscal resources to enable development and policy action.

It is felt that this fundamental component of the state of urbanisation need inclusion in this section for a number of reasons. However three are paramount: First, concepts and approaches adopted in the Global North, and aligned to contextual needs of the Global North, are fundamentally out of alignment with the contextual realities of the Southern urban transitions, demanding very different approaches and perspectives. Second references to slum urbanism and informality are often framed in negative terms, as an urban pathology, where urbanisation is seen as the issue. This fails to acknowledge the specific difference of the transition, and often then defers to development strategies that are ill suited. Given the fact that urbanisation globally is now largely driven by internal growth (as correctly detailed in this chapter), rural re-investment, agricultural development, new green revolutions, etc. that dominate food systems development discourses of the South, will not generate the developmental and FNS benefits imagined by development practitioners and the political class in these urbanising countries. Finally, given that development will take place, and that despite high levels of informality, formality, specifically in terms of physical infrastructure will take place and it is this infrastructure that will determine the nature of future urban and global food systems. Countering negative path dependencies is essential.

Ch1 references UN-Habitat NUA but Chapter 2 pays no attention to this.

3) The intersections between the impacts of urbanisation and the food system are having a profound impact determining global challenges, specifically climate change. Do these two factors not need linking
here, or at least acknowledgement that these are interconnected, and if urbanisation and food are considered differently, these could generate multiple global benefits?

4) While addressed in the governance section, is there not utility in describing some of the different governance opportunities as these relate to FNS systems and how these differ in rural and urban areas. My question is embedded in the comment in Ch1 that very different approaches are needed. As an example, the food safety discussion in this chapter reads as a drop in. However, would the point be better made if the differences in Food Safety governance in rural and urban are details, rather than simply saying food safety in urban areas presents challenges?

In addition to this:

2.2 Peri-urbanization and urbanization: Secondary cities face unique challenges. The relationship that cities have with other levels of government depends on their size such that primate cities, which comprise a large percentage of a country's urban population, tend to receive a larger share of public investment from central governments than their smaller counterparts (Henderson, 2002). While mentioned below it is suggested that greater emphasis is given to the contextual aspects associated with secondary (or intermediary cities) and the importance of not seeing all secondary cities as similar. These contextual, and typology differences result in very different UP FS challenges.

Figure 2.2: A simplified visualization of links between urbanization and food systems, with a focus on urbanization processes impacting consumption of food away from home - figure is confusing (and masks the complexity of the described interactions. It also categorises aspects in silo-ed ways. Further, it fails to capture the socio-material infrastructure intersections. Arguably it appears to undermine, or over-simplify the critical foundational point, that “The urban and peri-urban need to be understood as active agents in shaping food systems and FSN conditions.”

2.3 Links between urbanization processes and food systems: - Notably, while increasing dietary convergence across the urban-rural spectrum has been observed, household income remains an important determinant of diet and consumer behaviour, including higher animal source foods and fruit and vegetable consumption for higher income consumers (FAO et al., 2023; Warr, 2020). Indeed, links between food value chain transformations and dietary outcomes (i.e., undernourishment, micronutrient deficiencies, and excess consumption) are moderated by income, such that lower-income households suffer from poorer dietary outcomes across types of food value chains and across the rural-urban continuum relative to wealthier households (Gómez and Ricketts, 2013) (Page 17) – I question this, other research shows that infrastructure is a more important determining factor (Crush and McCordic, 2015; etc.), income is less important.

3.4.1 Food environment factors – impact of second urban transition on food environments, specifically how in many LMIC informal areas infrastructure is limited, or costly. This has two implications: 1) infrastructure is costly, and as a result, plays a far greater role in food choice than market or proximity to healthy foods might. Despite availability, preparing pulses and traditional foods might be made more costly overall given the infrastructure (water, energy, transport, time) cost. 2) given the state of
informality, many urbanites do not have kitchens, fridges, stoves, etc. As such the street is the larder, the kitchen, the dining table. This plays a significant but unrecognised role in FAFH factors.

As such a clear FE differentiation between current generalisations of the FE (informed largely by Northern positions) and Southern second urban transition factors need inclusion.

4.5.1 Urban and peri-urban agriculture (UPA) – while this section offers a useful and balanced conversation on UPA, it is felt that given the other detail documented in the report, a reflection on the presentation UPA as a solution in LMIC regions requires discussion, or mention at least? Given the extent of marginalisation in LMIC urban areas, the negative impacts and inequities associated with globalisation, etc. is it fitting to present UPA as the development solution to the FNS challenges. Many in the South have been and are still subjected to significant marginalisation, inequities and exclusion in the global agenda. Now, these same marginalised Southern urban residents are being asked to self-help, to solve systemic challenges that are not of their making. They are expected to be innovative, problem solve and become UPA experts in contexts that are far from opportune. The historical marginalisation is brushed aside, disregarded and trivialised. Problematically, when these Southern actors seek to find some solution to FNS issues through UPA, and fail, for the same historical, systemic and other contextual issues, they are then blamed, labelled as feckless, and lacking of initiative. Caution is required in such a report, specifically as the reasons that drive such FNS issues have previously been detailed, specifically in HLPE Report #18, and as discussed therein, simply attempting to grow oneself out of poverty and hunger, and wider inequities, is not possible.

Engagement with food safety – In Chapter 3 food safety is discussed but in a very general manner. In Chapter 4 it is again engaged, as a cross cutting issue. In Chapter 5, the deployment of food safety as a means of control and repression is effectively highlighted. These different engagements are at times contradictory, or can create confusion with readers, and policy makers, selecting the framing that suits their needs. Is a more active engagement in the positives, negatives, use for other reasons, etc. is necessary.

Figure 6.1: In ongoing work in African, Asian and some Caribbean cities, historical path dependencies were found to be a significant “contextual dimension” that needed detailed understanding, engagement and reflection as these factors played a significant role in the nature of the other contextual dimensions – does some recognition of this not need inclusion in the theory of change? This is asked given the point that “this radical transformation also means developing policy initiatives that reshape the underlying principles that guide current food systems activities” – these current underlying principles have a distinct genealogy and as such, impact both current and potential future actions.
50. Ministry of Agriculture of Hungary, Hungary

Dear Moderator,

Regarding the e-Consultation on the V0 draft of the HLPE-FSN report #19 „Strengthening urban and peri-urban food systems to achieve food security and nutrition in the context of urbanization and rural transformation“ we would like to provide the Hungarian comments in this e-mail, since we had troubles to register to the website:

Hungarian comments on the V0 draft of the HLPE-FSN report on strengthening urban and peri-urban food systems

1. Comment of the Ministry of Agriculture of Hungary:

The discussion of the topic is relevant, but it has very diverse aspects. In global terms, although we are talking about large cities, the economic, social and political arrangements are very different, and the settlements and their consumers have to be placed under different climatic conditions.

A greener, more livable urban environment can be suitable for the production of small amounts of vegetables or fruit in some places in cities, for example by creating community gardens and community squares (orchards with native species). These opportunities bring urban people closer to food production, whether for educational or recreational purposes. Regarding this, it is important to highlight that educational institutions with green areas, such as gardens in the courtyards of schools and kindergartens can take care for the training of future generations in this direction, in rising interest, which contributes to the increase of urban biodiversity and the reduction of surfaces covered with asphalt.

It is important to carry out appropriate impact studies and research to see if recent innovations (e.g. the vertical farming, production of microgreens in larger facilities and the production of laboratory meat as animal feed or for human consumption) truly help to improve the malnutrition of the poorer communities, if mass production reduces the price to a lower price category, increase the employment of people living in the city, and fully ensure food safety. It should be considered that these investigations should examine as many locations as possible, and plans should be prepared to maintain, establish and guarantee food supply and food safety throughout the entire food chain.

2. Comment of the research lead of the Hungarian Research Institute of Organic Agriculture:

It would be useful to include the definition of processed-ultra processed-fresh food or even a list of which food and food groups belong to the given categories. I did not find a related section in the report and I think it would be useful.

I recommend to have a reference to NOVA food classification system.

Subject: Enhancing the Effectiveness of Food Security Strategies in Urban and Peri-Urban Areas

Dear Colleagues,

I write to contribute to our ongoing dialogue on the draft report focusing on food security in urban and peri-urban areas. The draft is commendably structured and addresses many interrelated issues essential for advancing our understanding and action in this critical area. However, I wish to draw attention to several fundamental aspects, informed by our discussions and insights from initiatives like the Farafena Mali business plan, that could further enhance our approach.

1. Enabling Self-Upliftment Rather than Empowering:

The concept of empowerment, often well-intentioned, can unwittingly imply a position of granting power from a place of superiority. Instead, our approach should be about dismantling systemic barriers that hinder the self-upliftment of individuals at the 'base of the pyramid'. This shift in perspective respects the inherent capacities and agency of communities and individuals, recognizing their right and ability to lead their transformation.

2. Eliminating Paternalism and Condescension:

...
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It is vital to critically examine our processes, assumptions, and attitudes to eliminate any form of superiority, condescension, or paternalism. This requires a deep reflection on the language and notions we use, such as "high-level experts" and traditional educational hierarchies, which may inadvertently perpetuate elitist perspectives. We must strive for a more inclusive and egalitarian approach that values diverse voices and experiences.

3. Redefining 'High-Level Expertise':

The traditional definition of 'high-level experts' often relies heavily upon historical knowledge and conventional educational backgrounds, potentially overlooking the rich, context-specific insights that local experts hold. We must broaden our definition of expertise to include local, grassroots knowledge that is intimately connected to the lived experiences and challenges of urban and peri-urban communities. This shift will encourage innovative, disruptive solutions grounded in local realities, moving away from outdated models that may not adequately address current and future challenges.

4. Challenging Entrenched Intermediaries and Structures*:

It is crucial that we critically examine and openly question the roles of both anonymous and known intermediaries that dominate commercial food chains, regulatory frameworks, and financial flows. We should courageously identify and dismantle outdated structures that perpetuate inequity and inefficiency, making way for new paradigms that promote fairness and inclusivity. This transformation requires boldness in addressing entrenched power dynamics and the willingness to discard systems that no longer serve the collective good.

5. Implementing a Radically Transparent Global Platform:

The adoption of an open-source, universally accessible, and mandatory digital platform based on blockchain technology is imperative. Such a platform will ensure radical transparency and traceability, offering all stakeholders real-time access to 'immutable truth'. This level of transparency is essential for dismantling the opacity that allows current power brokers and intermediaries to resist meaningful change. By ensuring accountability and openness at every level, we pave the way for the successful implementation of the transformative actions outlined in the draft report.

While the draft report provides a robust framework for addressing food security in urban and peri-urban areas, these additional considerations aim to deepen our commitment to a truly inclusive, equitable, and transformative approach. By embracing these principles, we can ensure that our strategies are not only well-informed and forward-thinking but also grounded in the realities and aspirations of those most affected by our work.

Best regards,

Kevin Wilson

Global Forum on Food Security and Nutrition  www.fao.org/fsnforum
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52. Joaquín Pérez Martín, University of Buenos Aires - School of Agronomy, Argentina

1. The V0 draft introduces a conceptual framework informed by key principles established in previous HLPE-FSN reports (HLPE, 2017; HLPE, 2020).

After a first reading, the conceptual framework seems adequate, comprehensive and broad enough to have a global perspective towards the objectives of the report. However, I found some elements where I believe the perspective tends to weaken, in my opinion:

- When addressing the question of “urban foodsheds” it seems to me to be an incomplete perspective, given that urban food systems are supplied in a deregulated global framework and with presence of large food corporations and supermarket chains. A first quantitative approach to this phenomenon could be done analyzing food import data from different countries and regions (based on food import information from faostat), as well as the market share of supermarket chains (modern channel) in each of the countries (based on information from market consultations). The tendency on each of the food sectors to concentrate on fewer and fewer players, configuring concentrated markets, leads to a company supplying all cities in a country, regardless of where its production is located. Increases in the scale of transportation have made it possible to “reduce distances” and dismantle supply basins or foodsheds;

- Urban areas are in many times metropolitan areas comprise by different government levels, especially in the biggest cities, therefore usually national policies does not have much impact on the urban and peri-urban food systems. National policies usually deals with some issues that affect food systems (external trade, regulations, competition policies, etc.) local policies usually deals with transportation, retail, wholesale, there is a more accurate implication on local policies, rather than in national policies for urban and peri-urban food systems in my opinion.

3. Are the trends/variables/elements identified in the draft report the key ones to strengthen urban and peri-urban food systems? If not, which other elements should be considered?

The contrast/comparison between formal-modern vs informal-traditional food systems is a key aspect that I believe that might be strengthen. Except the European countries, and the US, among others, that rely around 70-80% on the modern retail channel, all the countries will rely on mix systems, in different amounts. In this sense, I suggest to update the Figure 4.2, particularly to capture an overview in the post COVID-19 context. Which kind of system provides a more accurate articulation of the supply towards food security in different sizes of cities? There are several trade-offs to explore that are key aspects for the report, I believe. One very complex to approach and crucial for food supply is scale of operation, that affect logistics, retailing and wholesaling offering important benefits, especially in big urban areas. Public infrastructure for retail and wholesale allows the increase of scale of operation, preserving competition. On the contrast, this kind of systems affects competition and the integration of SMEs and small farmers, among other relevant issues. In this sense, as a way to explore strategies in mix systems, I believe that is important to stress that informal markets when are permanent and have fix structures are able to compete with supermarkets, relying in the most valuable asset that is the physical presence of stores in the cities.
Regarding the “supermarketization” of food retail in cities, I would add that supermarket companies are transforming their operation developing stores that compete with convenience stores. Therefore, they increase their scale of operation with different type of stores, affecting competition. This is called omni-channel strategy by the supermarket sector, and I believe the best example to understand it is the through the recent trajectory of the French company Carrefour. In this sense, I suggest to consider analyzing both chapters 4.3.3. and 4.3.4. as an integrated chapter that focus on large scale retailing operators, beside the type of stores they have.

4. Is there additional quantitative or qualitative data that should be included?

As mentioned before, an analysis of food imports could bring a clear idea on the foodshed of the different urban areas in different countries. Also, global supermarket market data could anchored the role of the main global actor across each country.

To clarify and emphasize the links between urbanization processes and food systems (page 25) you could update the kind of analysis that is presented on the Appendix 1 (page 23) of the “Background paper by the OECD Secretariat” of the 2015 Latin American Competition Forum. Session III - Competition Issues in the Groceries Sector: Focus on Conduct (link). This kind of analysis establishes a clear pattern where supermarket chains-as the main retail global actor- expand in relation with the urbanization rate, income and middle-class size in each country, configuring urban food systems and food security.

I’ve explored the supermarket operation in several publications, especially the development of the omni-channel strategy in the Buenos Aires Metropolitan, Argentina, and the territorial expansion and accessibility due to urban income and density, it’s accesible on this link.

5. Are there any redundant facts or statements that could be eliminated from the V0 draft?

This statement could be revised: “Relatedly, food systems in much of the Global South have been shaped by policy prescriptions that orient them towards production for export and reliance on imports, which undermines the potential of local production for local consumption. This raises important questions addressed in the report about the power of individual cities to shape their food systems in the context of global trade regimes.” (pag. 16)

Those countries oriented towards food production and exports are more intensively linked to the dynamic of the global markets, mostly in terms of food prices, affecting food security. Food import countries are more likely due to limitations on the amount of land, inputs, etc.

Check citations:

- Kloppenberg et al., 1996 is note included in the bibliography
• Ferreyra and Roberts, 2018 is not included in the bibliography

6. Could you suggest case studies and success stories from countries that were able to strengthen urban and peri-urban food systems? In particular, the HLPE-FSN would seek contributions on:

I would suggest exploring the experience and results of the Grocery Code Adjudicator, the supermarket regulation from the UK, and those policies towards developing wholesale and retail public markets, potentially the south European experiences (Spain, France, Portugal)

53. Helen Prytherch, Swiss Tropical and Public Health Institute, Switzerland

Dear editorial team,

Thank you for the opportunity to engage in this process. The below reflections and inputs are provided on behalf of the Nutrition in City Ecosystems (NICE) project that is supported by the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation and implemented in 2 secondary cities in each of the countries Bangladesh, Kenya and Rwanda, with support of a Swiss public private partnership.

Do you find the proposed framework effective to highlight and discuss the key issues concerning urban and peri-urban food systems?

We appreciate the well-structured, effective framework proposed in the V0 draft, but wonder about the possibility to further introduce the value chain dimensions such as production, processing, transportation, consumption, but also governance into the framework. While they are deeply discussed in the V0 draft, they are, as to our understanding, not sufficiently reflected in the framework per se.

We particularly appreciate the strong (and visual) importance given to urban contexts and listing of factors influencing the urban context as we understand the sub-national (city) level as a key driver and potential entry point for sustainable food system transformation and tackling of malnutrition. This potential as an entry point could be further emphasized even though already strongly mentioned in the current V0 draft.

Is this a useful conceptual framework to provide practical guidance for policymakers?

See above, a more stringent expression of the different activity fields where the different variables of the framework have to be reflected within the value chain, might make the framework better understandable for policymakers.

Can you offer suggestions for examples to illustrate and facilitate the operationalization of the conceptual framework to address issues relevant for FSN?
While literature remains scarce, we are convinced that (emerging) literature discussing the successes of food policy councils as for example in Bambilor, Senegal, could further illustrate and facilitation of the operationalization of the conceptual framework.

A report by the Research Institute of Organic Agriculture (FiBL) and the city of Zurich assessing the food flows in Zurich, Switzerland, is a step to better understand Urban- Peri-Urban food systems in line with the proposed framework, but without fully implementing derived activities: Landert, J.; Vukotic, F.; Halter, L.; Wolfgramm, B.; Schleiffer, M.; Haupt, C.; Moschitz, H, 2021: Was isst Zürich? Handlungsspielräume auf lokaler Ebene zur Förderung einer nachhaltigen Ernährung, Schlussbericht (in German).

The report adopts the broader definition of food security (proposed by the HLPE-FSN in 2020), which includes six dimensions of food security: availability, access, utilization, stability, agency and sustainability.

**Does the V0 draft cover sufficiently the implications of this broader definition in U-PU food systems?**

The V0 draft prominently relays on the six dimensions of food security and strongly connects them to the Urban-Peri-Urban (U-PU) food system principles, including, within the conceptual framework. Further elaboration of the empowering à agency match and principle / dimension in the context of U-PU might be helpful.

Are the trends/variables/elements identified in the draft report the key ones to strengthen urban and peri-urban food systems? If not, which other elements should be considered?

Are there any other issues concerning urban and peri-urban food systems that have not been sufficiently covered in the draft report?

We acknowledge the broad inclusiveness of the V0 draft, discussing principles from a) productive and prosperous, b) generative, c) equitable, d) healthy & nutritious, e) diverse & resilient, and f) empowering in detail and without leaving out any of the steps in the value chains. We would appreciate further discussion and guidance on how to deal with imports into the U-PU food system that make up an important share in several contexts. Digitalization and its potential could be another important topic to quickly mention in this context.

Furthermore, we do feel (policies that address) poverty and inequality, build resilience and social inclusion and foster sustainable livelihoods, including through nutrition supported social assistance programs are not sufficiently addressed in the current V0 draft. Furthermore, for us the fact that in many secondary cities in LMIC, most citizens are still having access to farmland (even if only a few acres) and are still partly self-sustaining might be further highlighted in the report.

Are topics under- or over-represented in relation to their importance?
See above, we acknowledge the distribution of the topics in the V0 draft, particularly the high importance given to food systems governance incl. food policy councils and city networks. The concept of food system champions and respective discussion could further supplement these sections.

While the different trading channels such as market, street vendors, supermarkets are adequately discussed we would recommend to also include a big picture on food produce trade in U-PU areas per se, including broader discussion of import / export and related fields.

Is there additional quantitative or qualitative data that should be included?

Are there other references, publications, or traditional or different kind of knowledges, which should be considered?

We recommend to expand the section on territorial markets and their societal importance and produce flows (incl. how often produce changes hands to reach city markets and how they are competing with the fresh produce) by further discussing market mechanisms and interactions that could be key, incl. as for example per the following literature:


Furthermore, we recommend to introduce a short section on the potential of digitalization into the report, e.g. as per:

Speich C., Pannatier M., Berlin R., Freymond M., Monroy-Gomez J., Chigemezu Nwokoro C. et al. (2023). The potential of digital tools to foster production, and thus availability, of healthy diets for city dwellers in secondary cities. *E3S Web of Conferences* 418; [https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202341805001](https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202341805001)

Are there any redundant facts or statements that could be eliminated from the V0 draft?

We would like to highlight that several sections in chapter 6 are repetitions of chapter 5 – a combination of chapters 5 and 6 into one single chapter might better combine topics of policy development and respective institutions and stakeholders involved in these developments and discussions. A re-ordering of chapter 5 and 6 to be placed before the large chapter 4 discussing the key components of value chains and food system principles in detail might be considered.

Could you suggest case studies and success stories from countries that were able to strengthen urban and peri-urban food systems? In particular, the HLPE-FSN would seek contributions on:
evidence-based examples of successful interventions in urban and peri-urban food systems with the principles behind what made the process work;


Wasike et al., 2018 Linking Farmers, Indigenous Vegetables and Schools to Improve Diets and Nutrition in Busia County, Kenya

efforts made to enhance agency in urban and peri-urban food systems;


See the attachments:

- Inputs econsultation HLPE draft 0 NICE project

INPUTS

1) The V0 draft introduces a conceptual framework informed by key principles established in previous HLPE-FSN reports (HLPE, 2017; HLPE, 2020).

Do you find the proposed framework effective to highlight and discuss the key issues concerning urban and peri-urban food systems?

We appreciate the well-structured, effective framework proposed in the V0 draft, but are wondering about the possibility to further introduce the value chain dimensions such as production, processing, transportation, consumption, but also governance into the framework. While they are deeply discussed in the V0 draft, they are, as to our understanding, not sufficiently reflected in the framework per se. We particularly appreciate the strong (and visual) importance given to urban contexts and listing of factors influencing the urban context as we understand the sub-national (city) level as a key driver and potential entry point for sustainable food system transformation and tackling of malnutrition. This potential as an entry point could be further emphasized even though already strongly mentioned in the current V0 draft.

Is this a useful conceptual framework to provide practical guidance for policymakers?

See above, a more stringent expression of the different activity fields where the different variables of the framework have to be reflected in within the value chain, might make the framework better understandable for policymakers.
Can you offer suggestions for examples to illustrate and facilitate the operationalization of the conceptual framework to address issues relevant for FSN?

While literature remains scarce, we are convinced that (emerging) literature discussing the successes of food policy councils as for example in Bambilor, Senegal, could further illustrate and facilitation of the operationalization of the conceptual framework.

A report by the Research Institute of Organic Agriculture (FiBL) and the city of Zurich assessing the food flows in Zurich, Switzerland, is a step to better understand Urban- Peri-Urban food systems in line with the proposed framework, but without fully implementing derived activities: Landert, J.; Vukotic, F.; Halter, L.; Wolfgramm, B.; Schleiffer, M.; Haupt, C.; Moschitz, H, 2021: Was isst Zürich? Handlungsspielräume auf lokaler Ebene zur Förderung einer nachhaltigen Ernährung, Schlussbericht (in German).

2) The report adopts the broader definition of food security (proposed by the HLPE-FSN in 2020), which includes six dimensions of food security: availability, access, utilization, stability, agency and sustainability.

Does the V0 draft cover sufficiently the implications of this broader definition in U-PU food systems?

The V0 draft prominently relays on the six dimensions of food security and strongly connects them to the Urban-Peri-Urban (U-PU) food system principles, including, within the conceptual framework. Further elaboration of the empowering → agency match and principle / dimension in the context of U-PU might be helpful.

3) Are the trends/variables/elements identified in the draft report the key ones to strengthen urban and peri-urban food systems? If not, which other elements should be considered?

Are there any other issues concerning urban and peri-urban food systems that have not been sufficiently covered in the draft report?

We acknowledge the broad inclusiveness of the V0 draft, discussing principles from a) productive and prosperous, b) generative, c) equitable, d) healthy & nutritious, e) diverse & resilient, and f) empowering in detail and without leaving out any of the steps in the value chains. We would appreciate further discussion and guidance on how to deal with imports into the U-PU food system that make up an important share in several contexts. Digitalization and its potential could be another important topic to quickly mention in this context.

Furthermore, we do feel (policies that address) poverty and inequality, build resilience and social inclusion and foster sustainable livelihoods, including through nutrition supported social assistance programs are not sufficiently addressed in the current V0 draft. Furthermore, for us the fact that in many secondary cities in LMIC, most citizens are still having access to farmland (even if only a few acres) and are still partly self-sustaining might be further highlighted in the report.

Are topics under- or over-represented in relation to their importance?
See above, we acknowledge the distribution of the topics in the V0 draft, particularly the high importance given to food systems governance incl. food policy councils and city networks. The concept of food system champions and respective discussion could further supplement these sections.

While the different trading channels such as market, street vendors, supermarkets are adequately discussed we would recommend to also include a big picture on food produce trade in U-PU areas per se, including broader discussion of import / export and related fields.

4) Is there additional quantitative or qualitative data that should be included?

Are there other references, publications, or traditional or different kind of knowledges, which should be considered?

We recommend to expand the section on territorial markets and their societal importance and produce flows (incl. how often produce changes hands to reach city markets and how they are competing with the fresh produce) by further discussing market mechanisms and interactions that could be key, incl. as for example per the following literature:


Furthermore, we recommend to introduce a short section on the potential of digitalization into the report, e.g. as per:

Speich C., Pannatier M., Berlin R., Freymond M., Monroy-Gomez J., Chigemezu Nwokoro C. et al. (2023). The potential of digital tools to foster production, and thus availability, of healthy diets for city dwellers in secondary cities. E3S Web of Conferences 418; https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202341805001

5) Are there any redundant facts or statements that could be eliminated from the V0 draft?

We would like to highlight that several sections in chapter 6 are repetitions of chapter 5 – a combination of chapters 5 and 6 into one single chapter might better combine topics of policy development and respective institutions and stakeholders involved in these developments and discussions. A re-ordering of chapter 5 and 6 to be placed before the large chapter 4 discussing the key components of value chains and food system principles in detail might be considered.

6) Could you suggest case studies and success stories from countries that were able to strengthen urban and peri-urban food systems? In particular, the HLPE-FSN would seek contributions on:
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a) evidence-based examples of successful interventions in urban and peri-urban food systems with the principles behind what made the process work;


Wasike et al., 2018 Linking Farmers, Indigenous Vegetables and Schools to Improve Diets and Nutrition in Busia County, Kenya

b) efforts made to enhance agency in urban and peri-urban food systems;


c) efforts made to enhance the right to food in urban and peri-urban settings;

N/A

d) examples of circular economy and urban and peri-urban food system and climate change adaptation and mitigation, preferably beyond issues of production; and

N/A

e) examples of national and local government collaboration on urban and peri-urban food systems.

N/A

54. Robert Patterson, The Growing Connection, Canada

First, thanks very much to FSN/FAO folks for this stimulating paper and for managing these contributions. My work at The Growing Connection (www.thegrowingconnection.com) and at EcoHuerto (www.ecohuerto.mx) focuses very tightly on innovative, intensive and non-conventional horticulture at the household, school and community levels, thus I am (happily) not directly engaged in the policy-level issues. We do however have to deal with the consequences of "policy" however, so it is enlightening for me to get this valuable up-date on current thinking.

I do share the views of several of your contributors' comments (notably Egal and Bowness), specifically as regards actual field level options and activities.

The paper does seem to overlook the huge potential in innovative household-level production, and the potential for direct impact on family nutrition. There are myriad very low-cost, water-and-space efficient growing tools now available, allowing high yield production in non-traditional areas - I include out own sub-irrigated planter system here as well. The benefits - particularly for women and youth - are immediate and lasting, re: nutrition and income-generation.
Finally, while I recognize (especially after 30+ years at FAO) that institutional and academic studies will always skew towards elements that can easily be quantified (markets, prices, death, etc.), there is intrinsic value in trying to recognize and calculate the impact and value of less objective aspects of direct D-I-Y type initiatives - for instance taste/flavour, pride, dignity. These benefits should not be discounted or ignored, especially as they accrue to the most disenfranchised members of our communities.

55. Fatima Driouech, University Mohamed VI Polytechnic, Morocco

Dear FAO colleagues,

Congratulations for this first draft on a great and important topic that would help improving food security (though at relatively small scale in some regions), market access, Bio-food among others. Thank you also for the opportunity to provide comments.

While I am not a food systems specialist, I would like to make a few comments from the climate and water side.

It is good to see that a subsection (4.6.4) is dedicated to climate change, an aspect impacting not only agriculture but all the food systems. The 10-lines section indicates the need for climate research for assessing the impacts of climate change and extreme events on all aspects of food systems. The climate aspect is also mentioned from time to time across the report but given the importance of the dependence of food systems on climate and the effect of climate change, the report seems not giving enough place to these highly impactful pillars. Climate services for agriculture and food security are also missing (excluding a quick mention of climate tool kit) despite their usefulness and necessity for risk reduction, action planning and adaptation. The WMO report on the “State of Climate Services, Agriculture and Food Security” contains information that would help reducing this gap. Several other papers on climate services exists also.

The same remark is valid for water aspect which seems addressed at the same level of other environmental components. However, several questions arise about water availability for UPU agriculture, water related Food safety (risks and possibilities), potential conflictual uses, etc. A dedicated section to Water is all missing.

56. Muhammad Ariful Haque, Kamfisht Universe Engineering, Bangladesh

Dear All

I think that many urban and peri-urban residents have their own cultivable lands or have scope of cultivation in rural areas. If urban and peri-urban residents were engaged more in agriculture then the
food and nutrition system will be ultimately enriched. For example, I think if room farmers, balcony farmers, rooftop farmers to all types of farmers of urban and peri-urban residents were given smart renewable farmers identity card, technological and financial support, then it will not only promote urban and peri-urban agriculture but also mainstream rural agriculture. I think if there were a system to share First Selling Price-Location-Time (FS PLT) by label, receipt, QR code or any suitable way to the last consumer, then many problems would be solved. I think through many media consumers could be acknowledged about nutrition of each food and available alternate similar food. Culturally accepted, various new recipes could be introduced with higher nutrition and affordable cost. Using various electronic media with translation-transliteration, any resident from any urban and peri urban, can share his/her individual or group activity globally for the benefit of all. Like all others, I also wish for better food and nutrition security for all without discrimination.

57. Esosa Orhue, E-Warehouse Consulting, Nigeria

Dear all,

Conceptualizing this discourse is paramount to the actualization of food security globally both in the urban and peri-urban or rural areas in any nation of the world. The strength which this will galvanize, garnish the food system transformation in this context of urbanization and rural will give the needed desire to food security across the globe. This is why we are advocating for conducive atmosphere and environment that will foster food security especially the states actors for the non-state actors to build on as the foundation in order to thrive successfully.

However, whether urban, peri-urban or rural areas, they can only be classify as one in this context, because of who they deal with ‘human beings’ which are the mechanism to which this can be done, actualize and at the same time the beneficiaries of this food security system in the world, irrespective of population, intellectual capacity differences. In other words, the givers and takers are both humans. I would not want to categorize them into class as urban or peri-urban or rural because of human involve. On a nutshell, the most important point in the discourse is how their needs can be meant and contribution and observation be seen, accepted and taken seriously that will lead to transformation is my utmost delight in this.

For example, the global south majorly rely on the rural farmers for production for survival, this is why I removed the classification method. However, if this is true in the global south, there is high demand and tendency to see the two involve as one and their needs and demands and treated as same for high production for food security except otherwise. Considering infrastructures which enhance food production, and this is basically and practically lacking in the rural that could had strengthened their production if them were there, which the urban has and had not yielded nor increase the food production for food security. Invariably, concentrating development in the urban areas alone has not help these farmers to grow nor increased their products in order to salvage the demand of food security in the world. For example, the national security menace in Nigeria which has affected
productions and GDP of Agrifood in the country is mainly rural conflicts between farmers-herdsmen. The attacks are not on the urban areas but rural dwellers, which is just one of the concern issues to mention. In other words, there is need to look inward at the trajectory of development of urban and rural development that will bring inclusiveness, not concentrating on one and leaving the other and allowing the primary need of human to suffer. This has really affected the outcome of production, food security in the urban and the rural. Note, this is not just food security alone but other sectors.

Meanwhile, this misunderstanding of development, without prioritizing the need and those involve have led to rural-urban drift, were farmers have migrated to the cities and thereby becoming redundant to the society because of mis-prioritizing which policy makers of governance has refused to know, understand and taken lessons or learn from. The purpose of transformation is change, when a change occurs or made, definitely there would be transformation in the existence of human in that locality resulting to better living, ways of lives and doing things. And this calls for total change on policy making for policy makers on the principle of governance especially in the global south. That infrastructural needs are not negotiable nor basically the needs of urban dwellers alone also rural dwellers to see even distribution of food system in order to up-scale agricultural productions to meet food security and ensure SDG 1 and 2 is seriously meant.

Secondly, the issue of nutrition in this context most be address from the angle of rural dwellers because of lack of dissemination of information which is as a resulting of the above mention ‘infrastructures’; the means are not there to reach them to take cognizant of malnutrition. And due to this, most are naive of nutrition despite the natural food at their disposal. The principle of dissemination of information which involve infrastructural development needs to be enhance. This will involve both the state actors and non-state actors, which the civil society organizations, private sector, NGOs and others would be a major players of. Dissemination will involved them and bring them to the known, where well-nourished society will evolves in the rural-urban dwellers. Advocacy for urbanization can't cover rural dwellers nor development or strengthen food security in a nation. It most be joint effort to meet this demand of humans. Knowledge must be strengthened, production mechanism must be upgraded which involves skills enhancement. Research and programmes most be implemented for continuity and sustainability. Enlightening the rural dwellers about their health and food intake most be a priority to the global south. This will bring about good food diet that nourishes the body system for sustainability.

Ultimately, achieving these two glaring issues in the global south food system, these principles have to be considered and taken seriously, the infrastructural development of the rural areas that meet and commensurate with the production mechanism of farmers and policy makers and advocacy.

Secondly, the dissemination of information and advocacy on food nutrition should be made available door to door that centred on rural areas through programmes that will up-scale well nourished society.

Finally, this call is mainly on rural areas strengthening rather than urban areas, due to the level of drifting from rural to urban areas due to infrastructures. This is also applicable to the global north. The input should be centred on the rural areas more than urban to achieve the desire goals and objectives of the food system and SDG. This is sure and affordable way to reduce and minimize rural-urban drift.
that affects food production and security especially in the global south and have more productions to meet for human consumption.

Thank you.

Esosa.

58. Shadrack Mubanga Chisenga, Centre for Sustainable Development Solutions, South Africa

Please attached find comments.

See the attachments:

- Comments, Suggestions (plus recommendations)

59. Getaneh Gobezie, consultant, Ethiopia

Dear Manfred,

Thank you for your post about the work under RUNRES programme (also highlighted at Rural-21) in African countries (circular economy ....). The innovations to transform human waste, banana by products, etc into useful products is highly appreciated. ... Such interventions contributes greatly to sustainable development, .... As you highlighted clearly, the design and implementation also require participatory approaches (Participatory Rural Appraisals....), which still is relatively new in many development programmes.

The SNV and Hivos supported Africa Biogas Partnership Programme (ABPP) tried to implement Bio-gas programmes in some East African countries, to transform animal and human waste into production of domestic bio-gas for household and enterprise energy use, thus contributing to reducing deforestation, saving women's labour and time, etc) .... The bye-product (bio-slury") could also be used as "organic" fertilizer input (replacing the high-cost, imported "chemical" fertilizer), which can be used to promote food-crop production in urban-agriculture. ... Yet adoption of the technology (both by households and enterprises) was so slow after implementation for more than ten years – despite the
40% subsidy by governments and donors, and availability of easier access to credit from financial institutions.....

Our evaluation for SNV (2015) (attached) revealed that this was mainly because no serious efforts was made to make the promotion of the programme “participatory”. In particular, no serious effort was made on demand creation (as proposed under the IDS-COWASH) especially among households, which for long are used to traditional fule use (typically forest products, which often are freely available....). Also coordination of relevant partners and stakeholders, including those from the public sector, private sector, NGOs, households, etc was so challenging.

I believe this could help facilitate exchange of ideas going forward....

Thanks and Regards

Getaneh

See the attachments (additional materials):

- REPORT SNV Getaneh FINAL 5 Seleshi-SAROI.pdf
- Socio-Economic Hurdles To Widespread Adoption Of.pdf

---

60. **Manfred Kaufmann, Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation, Switzerland**

Dear FSN Moderator

I have seen that for some reasons the attachment to my previous comment produces an error message when one tries to open it. Hence I attach the content below directly in this textbox:

1) In general, the conceptual diagram makes sense, but I find that there is a mix up of concepts that have been defined in the literature. For example, stability cannot be simply related to the underlying principles of diversity & resilience (see p 10). Food Systems resilience and how to enhance it has been defined and detailed by several studies (e.g. Ingram et al 2023, Nature Food https://doi.org/10.1038/s43016-023-00762-5; Tendall et al 2015, Global Food Security http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.gfs.2015.08.001; Zurek et al 2022, Annual Review of Environment and Resources https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-environ-112320-050744). Furthermore, the stability of the food system depends on much more than diversity; diversity does play a role, but is far from the only factor determining the stability and resilience of the food system. Also, sustainability encompasses much more than regeneration and regeneration has its own definition that goes beyond sustainability (Luthe et al. 2023. Designing Resilient Regenerative Systems. educational program magazine. ETH Zurich, Systemic Design Labs). I understand that in a conceptual diagram you cannot have every
concept detailed, but having these “principles” underlying the “conditions” is, in my opinion, too much of a simplification of these concepts that are all in themselves complex.

2) I also think that the concept of circularity (or circular bioeconomy) should be presented in the conceptual diagram because the “metabolic rift” that exists now due to urbanization needs to be overcome. Currently, the a “mining” of the rural area (more specifically its soil nutrients, but also its human capital) is supporting the urban population with a minimal return. Hence, a circularity across the Rural-Urban nexus has to be established in order to reduce the current linear resource flow from the Rural to the Urban systems; here the peri-urban area plays a crucial role. In section 4.6.3. this issue is addressed, but I think much more could be elaborated on how to establish a circular bioeconomy within the urban and peri-urban food systems. In that sense, I would like to draw your attention to two articles written for a broader public on this issue and potential solutions:


More info can also be found on the following website: https://runres.ethz.ch/

And also here some illustrative videos can be found: a)
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zqfpABAbspg

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=N030skkaLTE

3) If deemed of interest, I would be willing to provide text and info to outline a case study (in a box or other format) on how to improve the resilience of the urban and peri-urban food system through innovation for establishing a circular bioeconomy. I would rely on the references provided above and would probably focus on one particular innovation that is illustrated in this video:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NSK72hi66PI

If this is of interest do not hesitate to contact me: jsix@ethz.ch

Farmers’ collectives with the help of private partners/ startups have helped maintaining the food supply chains during Covid-19 in India. Few of the examples are

   • Agrify Organic Solutions,

It is a Mumbai-based startup had volunteered to home deliver fresh vegetables and fruits during the Covid-19 lockdown and had worked with 500 farmers in Nashik district of India. The procedure followed was
All the farmers engaged with the startup pack the vegetables and store in clean warehouses from where it goes to Mumbai.
A 6-tonne capacity truck traveled to the metro city every day carrying 2500 boxes from where it is distributed to the housing societies.
All the payments were made via digital modes and a customer was expected to pay only after the delivery.
The boxes were delivered at one point of contact in the society, and every customer was expected to open the box in their house for hygiene purposes.

- Sahyadri Farms

Sahyadri Farms via its unique inclusive partnership with farmers has built a strong capability over the years in areas of primary processing of food and vegetables, semi-processed products like frozen & aseptic; processed products like fruit jams; tomato ketchup; fruit beverages and food and vegetables waste processing under an integrated zero discharge processing facility.

Sahyadri Farms began with the mission to ensure that the small-landholding farmers of India are given fair compensation for their produce and labour. This was achieved by adhering to global standards of agricultural practices, world-class infrastructure, international food safety standards, and the will to deliver safe, hygienic, and healthy food to the consumers.

During Covid-19 Sahyadri Farms (A Farmers' Producers collective), was delivering assorted fresh vegetable boxes in Mumbai, Nasik and Pune.

Consumers were able to choose from separate fruits and vegetables boxes and also with all the staples that they might need.

They were also delivering to housing societies with bulk orders.

- These successful example can guide us in designing a sustainable food supply chain that can ensure food and nutrition security even during the emergency conditions.

---

61. **Manfred Kaufmann, Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation, Switzerland**

Dear FSN Moderator

Congratulations to the first draft. In the attached file, I have included a comment by Prof. Johan Six, Sustainable Agroecosystems, ETH Zürich. Prof. Six is the principal investigator of the project "The Rural-Urban Nexus: Establishing a Nutrient Loop to Improve City Region Food System Resilience (RUNRES)" that aims to set a key step in the transformation towards a circular and more sustainable agriculture and waste management. The project is funded by the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation. I fully share the comments of Prof. Six and believe that a case study, (to be eg. provided in a separate box), on
innovations to establish a circular bioeconomy in the urban and peri-urban food system would add value to the report.

Dr. Manfred Kaufmann, Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation

62. Getaneh Gobezie, consultant, Ethiopia

Dear colleagues at FAO

I congratulate you on availing this very comprehensive doc..... Having reviewed it, I would like to reflect from the context of urban and peri-urban areas in developing countries of Africa... Below are some issues that can be emphasized more:

**Street Vendors** (p. 48....) are playing increasingly important role in ensuring food and nutrition security, affordable to low income earners.... Given the inflationary pressures in such areas, low (and even middle) income people, especially those salaried people and other dependent on fixed incomes, are increasingly resorting to utilizing such facilities. As such vendors are quite busy, morning to evening. ... Yet, they also face challenges, as the regulators try to promote formalization. ... Their informality also mean that they have little or no access to essential services like health standards, food safety, space for operation, access to finance, etc, which greatly limit their ability to meet the growing demand for their services.

This sector is dominantly run by women, and young people (including those school drop-outs) and inability to operate them means great loss of employment opportunity, and loss of income to feed themselves as well as their dependents.

**Behaviour change** (p. 98... ) matters greatly... While availability of food, and ability to afford to buy it has been often emphasized, knowledge and awareness about which food to take has meaningful impact on food and nutrition security. Indeed, the use to which income is put is as important in determining poverty and welfare as the level of income itself -- increased income can be (and often is) gambled away. The assumption of a "rational consumer" is often unattainable. There is ample evidence suggesting that a good deal of the problem related to malnutrition among women, children, etc can be substantially reduced through sheer education without even the household's income increasing. An earlier World Bank study suggests that malnutrition among children in Ethiopia can be reduced by more than 43% simply by educating mothers on nutrition (See: Luc Christiansen and Harold Alderman (2001); *Child Malnutrition in Ethiopia; Can Maternal Knowledge Augment The Role of Income?*) (attached)

The challenge on awareness and knowledge could be more pronounced among poor people in developing countries. ... Indeed advertising plays a pivotal role in informing consumers about food and shaping their choices, and **efforts to transform** food advertising could include promoting sustainable food in various public and private settings, ranging from public transport, schools, and healthcare facilities to television channels, events, advertisements, and social media. ... However, these forums may
not be easily accessible to majority engaged in the micro and small enterprise sector, and more suitable forums need to be explored. ... The good news is that following the innovative group lending modality of Grameen Bank (Bangladesh) in early 1980s, there is a proliferation of such groups (whose members reportedly reached more than 200 million, according to the Consultative Group to Assist the Poorest) in many developing countries which adopted such modality, and such groups assemble people regularly (often monthly and even weekly), which provide a great cost-effective platform to creating knowledge and awareness to a congregation of (poor) people, which could otherwise be very difficult to reach in any other forums. ... There are also savings and credit groups organized under Self Help Groups (e.g Village Savings and Loan Associations, V.S.L.As) of equivalent size to those in Grameen Bank style group lending.... The marginal cost of incorporating such awareness creation programmes is minimal ..... 

I hope this helps

Regards

Getaneh (getanehg2002@yahoo.com)

See the attachments:

- Child_malnutrition_in_Ethiopia_can_mater.pdf

63. Raga Elzaki, King Faisal Unveristy, Saudi Arabia

My contribution to this important issue is to identify important strategies for achieving the goal of strengthening urban and peri-urban food systems in the context of urbanization and rural transformation.

1- Create efficient and well-organized food supply chains that link rural farmers with urban market channels. This can decrease post-harvest losses, ensure timely delivery of fresh produce, and make nutritious food more available to urban consumers.

2- Encourage food processing and preservation facilities near urban regions. This can support extending the shelf life of unpreserved produce, reducing food waste, and ensuring a steady supply chain of food during the year.
64. Muhammad Bello Garba, Shehu Shagari University of Education, Sokoto – Nigeria, Nigeria

There are several ways to strengthen urban and peri-urban food systems in the context of urbanization and rural transformation. One way is to promote sustainable urban agriculture, which involves using vacant land in urban areas for food production. This can help to improve food security by reducing transportation costs and increasing the availability of fresh, nutritious food. Another way is to promote local food markets, which can help to connect farmers and consumers and provide an alternative to large-scale, industrial food systems.

Additionally, government policies can be developed to support the development of sustainable and equitable food systems, such as incentives for urban agriculture and regulations to protect local food markets.

65. ATIKA MAROUF, Seed Development Project (SDP) funded by IFAD, Sudan

Dear FSN-Moderator,

This is my contribution regarding Strengthening urban and peri-urban food systems to achieve food security and nutrition in the context of urbanization and rural transformation:

I have been working on agricultural development projects for more than ten years. I have noticed that small farmers and producers in the countryside face many problems, including climate change, which has negatively affected their production using the traditional methods they practice. It resulted in a significant food shortage. He must necessarily involve them in reversing their problems and developing proposals for solutions to them from their point of view, because they are the most knowledgeable about them, and the solutions proposed by them are certain to be the closest and most appropriate to them because the projects implement solutions from scientific and academic points of view at a higher level than their level of understanding. After empowering them, the countryside makes it possible for development and rural transformation to take place in gradual stages. The second point I suggest for development projects is to target the youth segment, especially the educated ones because they will contribute to the required change toward rural transformation more quickly.

Can you take it or consider it if possible, otherwise leave it, feel free no problem.

Best regards

Attika Marouf / SUDAN
Congratulations for this first draft. It is already a great instrument for discussion and advancing the FNS agenda in many localized agendas.

• Conceptual framework

Do you find the proposed framework effective to highlight and discuss the key issues concerning urban and peri-urban food systems?

The proposed framework is effective and very insightful. An additional point could be considered as “sustainable” alongside the regenerative agriculture. The “mixed use of U-PU land” can also a sustainable measure able to allure the private sector support (technical and financial) under their ESG agenda. Most of the urban soil is under private ownership, however, some of them can be used for: sustainability, utilization, agency, and availability.

For example, in many cities of Sao Paulo Metro area (Brazil), under the high voltage transmission wires, organic gardens spring up abandoned land and expand agroecology. These lands are private and are not enough to change food systems, but can promote behavioral change towards food utilization (food and nutrition education of school-aged children on the city ground, for example), sustainability (put the land to productivity use instead of being use as garbage dumps); agency (smallholder farmers living in the U-PU area can use this land to produce small batch of fruits and vegetables); and availability (locally sourced food for local restaurants and markets).

https://www.brasildefato.com.br/2021/11/25/sp-embaixo-dos-fios-hortas-o...

• Is this a useful conceptual framework to provide practical guidance for policymakers?

The conceptual framework is useful, but it does not dialogue a lot with the ESG agenda of the private sector, which is able to provide financial support, especially in the upper-middle and middle-income countries. Alignment with GRI indicators and nomenclature could me the private sector become interested in financially supporting the outputs of the HLPE.

Can you offer suggestions for examples to illustrate and facilitate the operationalization of the conceptual framework to address issues relevant for FSN?

• Are the trends/variables/elements identified in the draft report the key ones to strengthen urban and peri-urban food systems? If not, which other elements should be considered?

It is valid to mention the Small Island Developing States (SIDS). Fragile ecosystems, high vulnerability to climate change, natural disasters, external economic shocks, distance from global markets, and high

Global Forum on Food Security and Nutrition  www.fao.org/fsnforum
rates of all forms of malnutrition and food-related diseases are just some of the challenges hindering the development process for SIDS. In São Tomé and Principe, for example, more than 60% of the population lives in urban areas, however, more than 50% of the daily food basket is imported at the same time the country exports cocoa. Applying the conceptual framework in lands with physical limitations and already highly urbanized can become a challenge to be noted by the HLPE.


-------

• Could you suggest case studies and success stories from countries that were able to strengthen urban and peri-urban food systems?

Add in a single environment information on sustainable rural development, tourism, environment and healthy eating, where any citizen can explore and discover the rural areas of the city. This is the goal of the Sampa+Rural platform, idealized by the Municipality of Sao Paulo, Brazil. This initiative is complemented by studies on U-PU agriculture led by the Sao Paulo Food and Nutrition Security Observatory (ObSANPA).

Sampa+Rural seeks to connect rural areas to the city. It may seem surprising, but about one third of the territory of the municipality of São Paulo has rural characteristics. Concentrated in the southern, east and northern areas of the city, these areas have a huge potential for diversity. Simply put, you can find data on where to buy local products, who are the city's farmers and those who market these products. The platform also brings tourist attractions linked to nature and rural tourism, showing the environmental and economic characteristics of these regions. In addition, it is possible to find civil society and public power initiatives to make the city more connected to sustainable practices.

https://sampamaisrural.prefeitura.sp.gov.br/sobre

-------

Additionally, in the document there it is a mention to gender in Brazil.

“Gender disparities in food insecurity result from shocks and differences in education, income, opportunities, social networks, and entitlements.

Research in African and cities and Brazil indicate that although female headed households generally experience higher food insecurity than male headed households, when factors such as household income or education of household head are controlled for, this disadvantage disappears and sometimes even becomes an advantage (Dodson and Riley, 2020). This is in part attributed to women's greater role in food purchase and consumption decisions despite lower income (Levin et al., 1999).”
In Brazil, for the abovementioned reasons, the Bolsa Família is transferred preferably to the female in the household.

https://repositorio.ipea.gov.br/bitstream/11058/8051/1/td_2331.PDF

67. Jamila Adani, UM6P, Morocco

Congratulations for this first draft. It is very rich and insightful!

This topic is so complex that when reading this first draft, I kept questioning myself about some concepts that would enrich the existing framework:

1. **Reinventing the notion of space**: are we sure there are two spaces: rural and urban? The complexity of interactions along food value chains, from rural or peri-urban areas to final consumers in cities, requires an integrated approach that goes beyond the dichotomy «urban» and «rural». We should move from a unique urban or rural approach to a broader perspective that includes and displays the heterogeneity and also the interconnectivity of the territories and spaces that cover the different links of the agri-food system. To facilitate decision making, I believe we should be able to think beyond the «existing borders» and consider how they merge as a third space, a new “rurbanity” where rural and urban spaces combine and complement one another.

2. **Beyond food system**: we need to think of food systems in cities not only as a source of producing food but also as a source of producing services to the people and to the environment. Thinking of a new definition of development where agriculture and food can no longer be reduced to simply producing and consuming nutrients. HOW food is produced, traded and consumed is as important as what is produced and consumed. The challenge is less about feeding cities, after all, urban agriculture has a limited production potential, than about reintroducing nature and agriculture into the heart of the city, while simultaneously rebuilding social ties between people and preserving the environment. The symbolic dimension should not be ignored. I believe urban agriculture has aims other than food security, including social cohesion, education, capitalizing on the immaterial and intangible traditional cultivation...

3. **Intangible knowledge of traditional cultivation/food techniques in urban areas**: this includes capitalizing on practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, skills – as well as the instruments, objects, artifacts and cultural spaces associated therewith – that communities recognize as part of their food cultural heritage. In the preindustrial era, urban layouts were heavily shaped by food, as witnessed by the city center locations of sites such as markets and slaughterhouses. Urbanization pushed food and farming out of the city, engendering a progressive distancing between cities and their food. This distancing encompasses many forms, at once geographical, economic, cognitive and political. It is high time to introduce the reappropriation of food policies by urban actors to create harmony and cohesion, value the immaterial heritage beyond food security. Immigrants have had a big effect on the food and...
culinary scene of host cities, making them more vibrant and full of different kinds of food. People who moved to the city from all over the world took their food traditions, flavors, and cooking methods with them. This changed many cities food culture and made them global culinary spaces.

4. **The market**: one of the rare places where city and food come together. It is worth examining how markets continue to have a place in the urban areas bridging the gap between rural and urban spaces and shed light on this gap which is very relative though. This distancing between food and people is not taking place at the same pace in all parts of the world. In some cities, particularly in developing countries, the boundaries between urban and rural, producer and consumer, are almost non-existent. In Africa where I come from and in some Asian cities, people grow food, grind seeds, dry food and street-sellers cook in front of their customers and serve them directly ...In some developed countries, immigrants brought back their original food culture and this notion of street food to host countries. The best illustration is the street food booths in Manhattan in the heart of New York.

**Some successful interventions in urban and peri-urban food systems**: 

Some cities have pioneered this drive to reconnect with their food.

- **Toronto** has been trialing innovative urban food policies since the early 1990s, setting up the Toronto Food Policy Council to represent views from all areas of the food sector. This led to the expansion of community gardens on vacant lots in districts that had been identified as food deserts. Today, over 300 North American cities have a Food Policy Council.
- **Belo Horizonte**, Brazil's third city and the capital of Mina Gerais state, has also been extremely proactive in terms of its food policy. Two municipal bodies dedicated to food security were set up during the 1990s: the Municipal Supply Secretariat (SMAB) and the Municipal Council for Food Security and Nutrition (COMUSAN). The aim was to supply the city with healthy farm produce in a win-win relationship. On the one hand, the city's poor gained access to good quality food. On the other hand, rural and peri-urban farmers, who struggled to find buyers for their produce, had access to a larger market.
- **Havana** is one of the rare cities to have developed an urban agriculture model that is focused on food self-sufficiency. In the early 1990s, Cuba authorities decided to revise the food production system with the primary aim of being able to keep the capital supplied with food. Vacant open areas in Havana were transformed into kitchen gardens.

**trends/variables/elements identified in the draft report the key ones to strengthen urban and peri-urban food systems? If not, which other elements should be considered?**

I would suggest adding two focuses:

- **the role of farming extension in urban Farming systems**: farming recommendations that are usually applied in rural areas cannot easily be fully implemented in urban areas. The success of an agricultural development is also determined by the role of agricultural extension agents too and the way they manage the technology transfer.
• Promoting research and education in urban agriculture Urban AG is complex, diverse and dynamic and universities must contribute to exploring and testing sustainable solutions along with all the stakeholders. There is need for innovative research and extension partnerships to support the "urban farmers". Moreover, there is need for value creation of urban agriculture products, holistic urban planning partnerships, one health approaches for soil, water, energy and all the agro-ecological systems. Urban AG needs to be supported by innovative, applied research and transdisciplinary researchers. Universities can play a key role in bridging this gap and creating value through applied research in a transdisciplinary approach.

I wish you every success in your endeavours and I am very grateful to have been associated with giving feedback about this insightful work.

Jamila Adani-EMBA
Director Farming Development
OCP Group/UM6P/Al Moutmir -Morocco

68. Evan Bowness, Trent School of the Environment, Canada

Congratulations on this great V0 draft! I am very much looking forward to following this team through the process and to the final report. Just two comments:

3/Are there any other issues concerning urban and peri-urban food systems that have not been sufficiently covered in the draft report?

- I was surprised to see "Agroecology" only mentioned a few times in the draft. I would encourage more engagement with the literature on urban agroecology if possible.

- I would also like to see more engagement with the literature on urban food movements. For a conceptual framing that might be useful, consider the concept of "urban agrarianism" [https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/03066150.2020.1803842]

All the best,

Evan Bowness, PhD

Assistant Professor of Community Food Systems, Trent School of the Environment
69. Florence Egal, Food Security and Nutrition expert, Italy

Congratulations for a great zero draft. As for all “emerging” topics, HLPE reports are logically limited by the fact that available research has not been addressing them so far in a comprehensive way (which is why we definitely need to take stock of the State of the art but also to explicitly acknowledge gaps and limitations and needs for further research). It would be useful to relate this work to the work previously carried out by the CFS (OEWG Urbanization, Rural Transformation and Implications for Food Security and Nutrition), but also to the series of side events related to CFS, HLPF, UNFSS1 and UNFSS2.

I would be happy to expand and discuss on the following issues if relevant

1. Conceptual framework

Paradoxically I believe the approach followed is 1/ too urban centered and 2/ too SDG2 related for the CFS at this point in time.

The transformation of food systems is now acknowledged as a concrete means to bring together several SDGs. Nature-based solutions have been identified as an important dimension of sustainability and multi-level governance as a key issue. It is time to revisit development from a geographical perspective and reposition cities as key actors in sustainable territorial development and localization of SDGs.

Such an approach would in my view be more acceptable to both CFS members and the wider food and agriculture world, most of which have been reluctant so far to address urban issues, as they felt it would further increase the perceived bias towards urban areas and accelerate the marginalisation of rural areas. If instead we start framing the problem within an accountability perspective in which cities become responsible for more functional urban rural linkages, this could generate a behaviour change but also help to link the food security and nutrition agenda with other major agendas, such as climate change, social justice or more generally SDG localization.

We should follow our environment colleagues and adopt a territorial or biogeographical perspective (usually cross-border) in which cities play a key role rather than food sheds that are by definition urban-gearied and accelerate bias.

2. The six dimensions of food security:

As FAO staff member from 1990 to 2013, I witnessed the evolution from national food security to the three pillars, then the addition of the 4th one and since I retired the further addition of two more. This in my view reflected the internal and external evolution of food and agriculture partners and theories (including governments, donors and academia) and the tensions within different technical approaches often within the same organization. And then we spent most of a much needed energy to retrofit reality into a mould which has no logical basis, at the same time pushing development actors to accept the same mould. So no I do not think this is of much use and if we could stop adding more and more jargon which needs to be translated and explained across cultures, we could have a chance to get more people around the table.
3. Issues which would deserve more attention

The draft report should in my view pay more attention to right to food, social justice and environment (including recent CoPs on biodiversity and climate change). Cities and local governments were quite active and written material could be relevant.

At a time when cities are besieged and their inhabitants are food insecure and malnourished, the report should definitely include a section on conflict. Some information can be found at https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/iasc-reference-group-on-meeting-humanitarian-challenges-in-urban-areas

It might also be worth looking at culture, as food is a fundamental dimension of culture and cities are engaged in a variety of cultural initiatives, networks and programmes/projects.

The report mentions secondary cities. Increasing attention has been given lately to small and intermediary cities (e.g. OECD, UCLG). Is this the same?

On more specific issues, the attention provided by the report to short food chains and markets is most appreciated. Re. wholesale markets, land costs are becoming a major issue worldwide and the whole distribution systems is in transition with the development of e-commerce. Work on street foods (local and convenience foods) and the informal sector could add to this issue. Re. supermarketisation, it would be interesting to document the outcome of cash voucher programmes on purchasing practices and nutritional content of foods. The promotion of green leafy vegetables in Kenyan Ushumi supermarkets (Bioversity International) or of pre-cooked quinoa in Perú would constitute interesting examples of promotion of traditional foods.

Urban agriculture is also playing a key role in re-linking urban populations with nature.

More attention could be given to collective restauration: public procurement is one of the tools cities can use to transform food systems (and generate behaviour change) but the private sector (food services, HORECA…) are also active urban players.

Another issue is that of solidarity networks and urban-rural linkages, which as far as I know have not been explicitly researched and documented. For example strong linkages exist between urban households and communities of origin. Villagers send to their families in town (fresh) agricultural products and fuelwood. Urban families in exchange send sugar, flour, salt and other food products during the hungry season. This is particularly the case for rural-urban migrants and indigenous people.

Not enough attention to solidarity networks or related initiatives. The comedores populares movement in Latin America are a key example of women's empowerment.

The legal and regulatory challenges go far beyond taxation issues.

4. Additional references
The team may have already reviewed and regarded the following documents or links

- Promises and Challenges of the informal food sector in developing countries [https://www.fao.org/3/a1124e/a1124e00.htm](https://www.fao.org/3/a1124e/a1124e00.htm)

**70. Dieudonné KEBA, SOCIETE SOMMAC, Democratic Republic of the Congo**

L'alimentation des villes est aujourd'hui un front de recherche à la croisée des sciences sociales, techniques et agronomiques. Ce thème invite à dépasser les frontières habituelles entre politiques publiques sectorielles (agriculture, urbanisme, environnement) et entre disciplines scientifiques (Steel, 2009). L'alimentation peut en effet être un levier pour améliorer la durabilité des villes, en lien avec des enjeux de nutrition-santé, d'éducation, de développement économique, d'environnement et de cohésion sociale. Et réciproquement, les villes s'affirment progressivement comme des acteurs moteurs du changement et elles apparaissent comme des échelles pertinentes pour améliorer la durabilité de l'alimentation. Les questions alimentaires commencent à être prises en considération dans les politiques urbaines, notamment à travers les questions d'aménagement (Morgan, 2009 ; 2013). Dans les pays anglo-saxons, les enjeux alimentaires sont entrés depuis une quinzaine d'années dans les conceptions de la durabilité urbaine et dans les politiques d'aménagement, notamment au Royaume-Uni, aux États-Unis ou au Canada, qui disposent à la fois d'une communauté de recherche très structurée sur ce thème et d'expérimentations dans différentes villes (Blay-Palmer, 2010 ; Plantinga et Derkzen, 2012 ; Stierand, 2012). L'alimentation n'est plus un ovni dans les politiques d'aménagement urbain (Pothukuchi et Kaufman, 2000).

La pandémie de Covid-19 et sa cohorte de restrictions sociales ont mis en lumière la fragilité des systèmes alimentaires urbains, notamment ceux alimentés par des circuits longs.

**71. Nasrullah Bangulzai, Lasbela Univesity of Agriculture water and Marine Sciences Uthal Balochistan, Pakistan**

Strengthening urban and peri-urban food systems to achieve food security and nutrition in the context of urbanization and rural transformation.

in view of the topic it is suggested that food system is dependent variable that influence the food security for me so far the designed projects in this regards are not effective because designed project are (projects for the sake of project ) that's why there is no significant change in the life of main stake holders.it will be better to involve the main stake holders farmers academia and private sector with the
help of NGOs like FAO WFP. on behalf of my personal experience I have observed that the main stakeholders have good resources but not aware how to use these resources like milk meat hair wool and agri cash crops in judicious manner. There is dire need to educate the masses at their door steps. for this purpose at union council or these levels small scale collection center for milk and feed lot fattening units may introduced.it will bring a change in the life of farm communities directly which will improve food system and food security can be achieved.

Thanks

72. Amanullah, Department of Agronomy, The University of Agriculture Peshawar, Pakistan

How to strengthen the urban and peri-urban food systems to achieve food security and nutrition in Pakistan?

Strengthening urban and peri-urban food systems to achieve food security and nutrition in Pakistan involves a comprehensive and multi-faceted approach. Here are several strategies that can be considered:

1. **Promoting Urban Agriculture:**
   - Encourage and support urban agriculture initiatives, including rooftop gardens, community gardens, and vertical farming, to increase local food production.
   - Provide training and resources to urban farmers on sustainable and efficient farming practices.

2. **Enhancing Distribution Networks:**
   - Develop efficient and reliable transportation and distribution networks to ensure the timely and safe delivery of fresh produce from rural to urban areas.
   - Establish farmers' markets and direct-to-consumer selling mechanisms to reduce the reliance on lengthy supply chains.

3. **Improving Storage and Processing Facilities:**
   - Invest in modern storage facilities to reduce post-harvest losses and ensure a steady supply of food throughout the year.
   - Support the development of food processing industries in peri-urban areas to add value to agricultural products and create employment opportunities.

4. **Implementing Sustainable Practices:**
   - Promote sustainable agricultural practices to protect the environment and ensure long-term food security.
   - Encourage the use of organic farming methods, efficient water management, and eco-friendly pest control measures.

5. **Empowering Local Communities:**
   - Involve local communities in decision-making processes related to food systems.
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- Support community-based initiatives that focus on nutrition education, especially for vulnerable populations.

6. **Leveraging Technology:**
   - Integrate technology in agriculture for improved productivity and resource management.
   - Develop and promote mobile applications that connect farmers with consumers and provide information on sustainable farming practices.

7. **Diversifying Food Sources:**
   - Promote a diverse range of crops to enhance dietary diversity and improve nutrition.
   - Encourage the cultivation of indigenous and climate-resilient crops suitable for urban and peri-urban environments.

8. **Policy Support and Coordination:**
   - Develop and implement supportive policies that address the unique challenges of urban and peri-urban agriculture.
   - Coordinate efforts among government agencies, non-profit organizations, and the private sector to create a unified approach to food security.

9. **Research and Innovation:**
   - Invest in research and development to find innovative solutions for urban and peri-urban agriculture challenges.
   - Support the adoption of advanced technologies and best practices through research-based interventions.

10. **Capacity Building:**
    - Provide training programs for farmers, especially in peri-urban areas, to enhance their skills in modern agricultural practices.
    - Invest in educational programs that focus on sustainable farming, nutrition, and food safety.

By implementing these strategies, Pakistan can strengthen its urban and peri-urban food systems, ensuring a more resilient and nutritionally secure future for its population.

---

**73. Ignacio Moncayo, FAO, Chile**

En el capítulo 4.6 Cross-cutting issues, específicamente en la Table 4.1: Challenges and opportunities for food security and sustainable, inclusive and healthy urban food systems, sugiero incluir una categoría en la fila de Retail and food service.

Esta categoría se podría llamar "Supermercados Cooperativos y Cooperativas de Consumo". Se trata de un actor relevante del retail en algunos países, y en otros sería deseable promover su creación, desarrollo y/o crecimiento. Se trata de un modelo de consumo sostenible, donde la propiedad del negocio es de los propios consumidores, permitiendo alinear sus procesos y estrategias en función de la distribución de alimentos, y no de modelos comerciales basados en productos financieros.
Se sugiere la siguiente estructura de columnas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supermercados cooperativos y cooperativas de consumo</th>
<th>Common perceptions</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Las cooperativas son modelos anticuados y se preocupan básicamente de la producción.</td>
<td>En algunos países los principales actores del retail de alimentos son cooperativas de consumo, aspecto que es desconocido por gran parte de los consumidores. La competencia del modelo predominante de retail de alimentos no prioriza la distribución de alimentos, sino que desarrolla estrategias agresivas de financiarización donde los proveedores se endeudan para producir y los consumidores se endeudan para consumir.</td>
<td>Los supermercados cooperativos y las cooperativas de consumo tienen como objetivo la distribución de alimentos hacia sus asociados-consumidores, y no la maximización de utilidades. Esto ha significado que sus procesos se alinean intuitivamente a las seis dimensiones de la seguridad alimentaria propuestas: disponibilidad, acceso, utilización, estabilidad, arbitrio y sostenibilidad. Con ello, permite llegar con tiendas a barrios y territorios donde no llegan las grandes cadenas de supermercados, permite generar vínculos robustos y de largo plazo con pequeños proveedores locales de alimentos frescos, ofrecer precios accesibles, y a la vez desarrollar prácticas sostenibles que no son “rentables” para el retail tradicional.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**74. Benjamin D.B. Barkollie, Jr, Liberia Network on the Right to Food (LINORF), Liberia**

B. Is this a useful conceptual framework to provide practical guidance for policymakers?

Yes, referencing established principles from previous reports can be beneficial in creating a robust conceptual framework. To make it more practical for policymakers, consider incorporating case studies or real-world scenarios that demonstrate how the framework can be applied to tackle specific food security and nutrition issues. For instance, highlighting successful policy implementations in different regions or showcasing innovative approaches used by governments or organizations to address food security challenges could make the framework more actionable and relatable.
The V0 draft introduces a conceptual framework informed by key principles established in previous HLPE-FSN reports (HLPE, 2017; HLPE, 2020).

Do you find the proposed framework effective to highlight and discuss the key issues concerning urban and peri-urban food systems?

The use of established principles from previous reports in the conceptual framework is a promising approach. However, the effectiveness of the framework in highlighting and discussing key issues concerning urban and peri-urban food systems depends on its ability to comprehensively address the specific challenges, dynamics, and interactions within these systems. Reviewing how well it covers aspects like urban agriculture, food distribution, access, and sustainability will determine its effectiveness in addressing these crucial issues.