



EN

**THIS ACTION IS FUNDED BY THE EUROPEAN UNION**

**ANNEX 8**

to the Commission Implementing Decision on the financing of the multiannual action plan for the thematic programme on Global Challenges (Prosperity) for 2023-2025

**Action Document for Sustainable Aquatic and Agricultural Food Systems (SAAFS)**

**MULTI ANNUAL PLAN**

This document constitutes the multiannual work programme within the meaning of Article 110(2) of the Financial Regulation, within the meaning of Article 23 of the NDICI-Global Europe Regulation.

**1. SYNOPSIS**

**1.1. Action Summary Table**

<b>1. Title CRIS/OPSYS business reference Basic Act</b>	<b>Sustainable Aquatic and Agricultural Food Systems (SAAFS)</b> OPSYS ref: ACT-62080 Financed under the Neighbourhood, Development and International Cooperation Instrument ( <u>NDICI-Global Europe</u> )
<b>2. Team Europe Initiative (TEI)</b>	No
<b>3. Zone benefiting from the action</b>	Following the geographisation and subsidiarity principles underpinning the 2021-2027 programming, the Global Challenges Programme will deploy its resources strategically to support truly global action, promoting EU's priorities and values.
<b>4. Programming document</b>	NDICI Global Challenges; Multi-annual Indicative Programme 2021-2027 <sup>1</sup>
<b>5. Link with relevant MIP(s) objectives/expected results</b>	Prosperity Objective 6 (Transition to Resilient and Sustainable Agri-Food Systems)
<b>PRIORITY AREAS AND SECTOR INFORMATION</b>	
<b>6. Priority Area(s), sectors</b>	Priority Area 6: Prosperity; Resilient and Sustainable Aquatic and Agri-Food Systems
<b>7. Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)</b>	Main SDG: SDG 2 (Zero Hunger) Secondary SDGs: 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 12, 13, 14 and 15
<b>8 a) DAC code(s)</b>	43071 – Food Security Policy and administrative management – 40% 52010 - Food aid/Food security programmes - 30% 99810 - Sectors not specified – 30%
<b>8 b) Main Delivery Channel</b>	Agrobiodiversity: (i). Global Forum on Agricultural Research and Innovation (GFAR) – IFAD - 41108; (ii). International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRFA): Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO)-41301 and (iii). Application of economic valuation to promote agro-biodiversity mainstreaming in food systems: United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) - 41116

<sup>1</sup> C(2021)9157

	<p>Land: The International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) – 41108 and/or FAO - 41301</p> <p>New Aquatic Food Value Chains (NAVAC): FAO-41301</p> <p>Plant Health: CABI-47000</p> <p>Agricultural Market Information System (AMIS): FAO-41301</p> <p>Food System Summit (FSS) follow up: FAO – 41301</p> <p>National Information Platforms for Nutrition (NIPN) and Nutrition information Systems (NIS): UNICEF - 41122 and/or WHO – 41321, GIZ - 52</p> <p>N4G: French Government - 4</p> <p>Global Network against Food Crises (GNAFC): FAO (41310) and/or WFP - 41140, UNICEF - 41122</p> <p>Scientific Evidence for Sustainable Agri-Food Systems and fisheries (SESASF): Joint Research Centre (JRC) – 1</p> <p>Global Donor Platform for Rural Development (GDPRD): IFAD - 41108</p>			
<b>9. Targets</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Migration <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Climate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Social inclusion and Human Development <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gender <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biodiversity <input type="checkbox"/> Education <input type="checkbox"/> Human Rights, Democracy and Governance			
<b>10. Markers (from DAC form)</b>	<b>General policy objective @</b>	<b>Not targeted</b>	<b>Significant objective</b>	<b>Principal objective</b>
	Participation development/good governance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Aid to environment @	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Gender equality and women's and girl's empowerment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Reproductive, maternal, new-born and child health	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Disaster Risk Reduction @	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Inclusion of persons with Disabilities @	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Nutrition @	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<b>RIO Convention markers</b>	<b>Not targeted</b>	<b>Significant objective</b>	<b>Principal objective</b>
	Biological diversity @	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Combat desertification @	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Climate change mitigation @	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Climate change adaptation @	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>11. Internal markers and Tags:</b>	<b>Policy objectives</b>	<b>Not targeted</b>	<b>Significant objective</b>	<b>Principal objective</b>
	Digitalisation @	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	digital connectivity digital governance digital entrepreneurship digital skills/literacy digital services		YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
	Connectivity @	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	digital connectivity energy transport health education and research		YES <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Migration @	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Reduction of Inequalities (methodology for marker and tagging under development)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Covid-19	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>BUDGET INFORMATION</b>				
<b>12. Amounts concerned</b>	Budget line(s) (article, item): 14.020242 Total estimated cost for 2023-2025: EUR 67,194,132.67 Total amount of the EU budget contribution for 2023-2025: EUR 67,194,132.67 The contribution is for an amount of EUR 32,394,132.67 from the general budget of the European Union for financial year 2023, for an amount of EUR 23,800,000 million from the general budget of the European Union for financial year 2024, and for an amount of EUR 11,00,000 million from the general budget of the European Union for financial year 2025, subject to the availability of appropriations for the respective financial years following the adoption of the relevant annual budget, or as provided for in the system of provisional twelfths.			
<b>MANAGEMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION</b>				
<b>13. Type of financing</b>	<b>Indirect Management</b> with international organisations and/or EU Member States will be carried out in accordance with the criteria set out in section 4.3.1. An <b>administrative agreement</b> is planned with Commission services.			

## 1.2. Summary of the Action

Current food systems, including aquatic and agricultural production, are contributing significantly to biodiversity and ecosystem loss, deforestation, and climate change, often have negative environmental impacts (soil, water), and are driving global trends towards poor diets and related diseases. They are also increasingly affected by climate change, environmental degradation, fragility, and conflicts. At the same time, they do not provide sufficient scope for decent livelihoods, particularly for young people, women, and persons with disabilities. The EU's Green Deal Farm-to-Fork Strategy<sup>2</sup> and the 2021 UN Food Systems Summit underlined the importance of the transformation of food systems. The imperative to work on food systems transformation was further highlighted at the 2021 Nutrition for Growth

<sup>2</sup> Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the European Council, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions — The European Green Deal ([COM\(2019\) 640 final](#), 11.12.2019)

(N4G) Summit, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) 27<sup>th</sup> Conference of the Parties (COP27) held in 2022, and the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) COP15 (2023). With the establishment of over 100 country food system transformation pathways, involving all relevant actors (public and private sector, civil society), prospects have been created for change towards sustainable food systems, in coherence with, amongst others, the Post 2020 Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF). The quality of the implementation of this agenda is of essence to the implementation of Agenda 2030 and to the interests of the EU. By selecting strategic support interventions, optimal leverage will be sought to advance EU priorities. The proposed Action aims to facilitate and enhance the transition to sustainable food systems globally, combining a number of related initiatives in a coherent programme, providing synergies with relevant regional and national level programmes, and in particular to complement EU country-based actions. The proposed Action is in line with the EU Biodiversity Strategy for 2030<sup>3</sup>, especially with the pillar on EU action to support biodiversity globally. It is also fully aligned with the EU Green Deal, with the European Consensus for Development and with the Agenda 2030 for Sustainable Development, and. It will therefore contribute to various Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), most notably SDG 2 (Zero Hunger) and SDGs 1 (No Poverty), 3 (Good Health and Well-Being), 5 (Gender Equality), 6 (Clean Water and Sanitation), 8 (Decent Work and Economic Growth), 12 (Responsible Consumption and Production), 13 (Climate Action), 14 (Life Below Water) and 15 (Life on Land). It will also contribute to the implementation of the EU Gender Action Plan III (GAP III).

The proposed Action has four components, as follows:

1. Fostering Agrobiodiversity and land governance (EUR 15 million)
2. New Aquatic food Value Chains -NAVAC (EUR 20 million)
3. Reducing crop losses through plant health (EUR 7 million)
4. Enhancing knowledge-based food systems governance (EUR 25.2 million)

**Component 1 Agrobiodiversity and land governance** comprises four interrelated interventions: (i). Support to the Global Forum on Agricultural Research and Innovation (GFAR) ‘Inclusive Partnerships for sustainable agri-food systems transformation’, with a view to ensuring that small-scale producers (SSPs) are key actors and co-innovators and participate meaningfully in the priority setting and governance of research and innovation (R&I) programmes and projects. GFAR Executive Secretariat has held consultations with its main stakeholders about hosting options and should conclude in the course of 2023 on the most appropriate arrangements strengthening synergies for policy and research engagement and funding mobilisation; (ii). Support to the ‘Seeds of transformational and collaborative action: advancing the 2030 Global Biodiversity Framework in agrobiodiversity’ which aims to support farmers’ management of, and access to, agrobiodiversity, and to deliver global public goods and services as called for by the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRFA) and the Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF). Implementation will be assured by FAO/ITPGRFA with whom the European Commission<sup>4</sup> holds an existing Contribution Agreement (iii). The intervention in support of the application of the ‘Economic valuation to promote agrobiodiversity mainstreaming in food systems’ intends to increase the adoption of practices that promote agrobiodiversity and thus contribute to the (GBF). This will be achieved by providing support to partner countries and EU Delegations to make the economic case for mainstreaming policy scenarios that enhance agrobiodiversity. The proposed implementing partner is UNEP. (iv) On land governance, the intervention will seek to better link land governance to the food system transformation agenda through support to international networks promoting secure and equitable land tenure and sustainable land governance in the context of sustainable, agroecological approaches. The implementing partner will be an international organisation selected in line with the criteria detailed below.

**Component 2 New Aquatic food Value Chains (NAVAC)** will support the development of resilient and sustainable aquatic food product value chains to increase the availability and accessibility of nutritious and safe aquatic foods to vulnerable populations. To this end, support will be provided to improving global and local expertise on the inclusion of aquatic foods (including in particular local low-trophic species like algae, herbivore fish and molluscs and other invertebrates and other low valued and underutilised aquatic resources), and fish by-products in the prevention and response to food and nutrition crises, and by improving awareness on the nutrition potential of new aquatic food products and the development of market acceptance. The proposed implementing partner is FAO.

**Component 3 Plant Health** aims to reduce crop losses and increase food safety by promoting the uptake of climate-smart and biodiversity friendly plant health practices, developing capacity and systems for local production and

<sup>3</sup> European Commission, Directorate-General for Environment, *EU biodiversity strategy for 2030 – Bringing nature back into our lives*, Publications Office of the European Union, 2021, <https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2779/677548> [Accessed on 13/09/2023]

<sup>4</sup> Hereafter referred to as the Commission

distribution of low-risk plant protection products, increasing the supply of safer food through enterprises driven by women and youth, and strengthening systems for the detection and response to pest outbreaks. The proposed implementing partner is the Centre for Agriculture and Bioscience International (CABI).

**Component 4 Food system governance** is made up of six interrelated interventions.

(i). The G20 Agricultural Market Information System (**AMIS**) – which was created in 2011 as part of the G20 Action Plan on Food Price Volatility and Agriculture in order to enhance international food markets' transparency and related policy coordination for wheat, maize, rice and soybeans in times of market uncertainty. Over the past ten years, AMIS has become a globally respected source of information on food markets, regularly providing up-to-date, reliable and comparable information. It aims to prevent unexpected price hikes and strengthen global food security. The action will support the extension of coverage of AMIS (fertilisers; stock information). AMIS is hosted by FAO.

(ii). Follow up to the 2021 **Food Systems Summit (FSS)** will support the work of the UN Food Systems Coordination Hub in fostering food systems change at global and national levels. It aims to enhance the global coordination of support for the implementation of food systems transformation in partner countries; catalyse actions in support of implementation of selected national food systems transformation pathways; connect science and knowledge communities with policy making and investment prioritisation, linking global and national levels, and foster the shift towards a new Food Finance Architecture. The hub is hosted by FAO.

(iii). Nutrition related interventions include support for the National Information Platforms for Nutrition (**NIPN**) and the Nutrition Information Systems (**NIS**) with a view to improving the production and use of nutrition data at national level in partner countries. Considering the positive results obtained with both programmes but also potential overlaps in their objectives, it is proposed to evaluate how to merge some of their activities by setting up a transitional phase before envisaging a new common/joint phase. Support will also be provided for the 2024 Nutrition for Growth (N4G) summit organised by France, as well as for the Global Nutrition Report (GNR) which tracks the commitments made by nutrition stakeholders' during the N4G summit and progress on nutrition recorded by all the parties involved. These interventions are implemented by different partners including GIZ, UNICEF, the WHO and CATIE for NIPN and NIS issues. Support to N4G will be implemented by the French Ministry of Foreign affairs

(iv). The Global Network against Food Crises (**GN AFC**) which was launched in 2016 is a global platform for coordination along the humanitarian-development-peace axis. The six current members are EU, FAO, WFP, USAID, World Bank and UNICEF. The aim of this network is to improve the analysis, evidence and consensus on food crises, and collective efforts to prevent and respond to them. Its main deliverable is the annual Global Report on Food Crises.

(v). Scientific Evidence for Sustainable Agri-Food Systems and Fisheries (**SES AFS**), which will improve the use of **JRC** scientific and technical expertise and knowledge management, in collaboration with international and national stakeholders, to support EU cooperation policies and actions in Sustainable Agri-Food Systems and Fisheries.

(vi). The Global Donor Platform for Rural Development (**GDPRD**), a network of 40 bilateral and multilateral donors, international financial institutions, intergovernmental organisations, foundations, and development agencies set up in 2003 following the first High-Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in 2002, will also continue to receive support. The main goal of this platform is to improve donor collaboration with a view to enhancing the impact of donor policies, investments and interventions related to food systems and rural development. The platform is hosted by IFAD.

In terms of implementation, Contribution Agreements with International/Member State Organisations will be the main contracting modality. An Administrative Agreement is planned with the the Commission and a Delegation Agreement with a Member State agency.

## 2. RATIONALE

### 2.1 Context

The Global Challenges Programme of the Neighbourhood, Development and International Cooperation Instrument – Global Europe (NDICI-Global Europe) sets out the global and multilateral dimension for the implementation of the EU's political priorities. It aims to strengthen the EU as a global actor in the delivery of the 2030 Agenda and the Paris Agreement to help eradicate poverty, reduce inequalities, and achieve sustainable development. The structure of the Global Challenges programme reflects the key intertwined themes of the 2030 Agenda that shape the SDGs: People, Planet, Prosperity and Partnership. The four pillars of the global challenges programme as well as the actions proposed in the individual AAPs are mutually reinforcing and interlinked. The **Prosperity pillar** provides the framework for the EU's political priority of 'an economy that works for the people and for the planet. This MAAP

2023-2025 addresses the global dimension of the efforts needed to create and promote decent, green jobs, especially for women and young people and in doing so it is supporting the implementation of the Global Gateway. It aims to strengthen the actions targeting sustainable value chains, addressing the accompanying due diligence measures, supporting increasing transparency and traceability, and promoting measures to facilitate trade in partner countries. It also supports the green and digital transitions of partner countries, promoting climate-neutral, circular, sustainable economic development and resilient economies, and advocating for resilient and **sustainable agri-food systems**. Globally, aquatic and agri-food systems face challenges related to climate change, biodiversity, resource use, access to decent work for better wages, child labour, and nutritional outcomes. Over the years, development models based on high levels of inputs and resource-intensive farming/aquaculture have, on the one hand, contributed to increased food availability and lower food prices to feed a growing population, but on the other hand, neglected the impact of over-exploitation of resources, and environmental damage, as well as of poor diet and highly processed foods on human health. Whereas multiple studies have demonstrated the potential that agriculture, fisheries, and aquaculture can offer for poverty reduction, inclusive growth and climate change mitigation, unsustainable agricultural, fisheries and aquaculture practices continue to be responsible for deforestation, biodiversity loss, destruction of ecosystems such as wetlands and mangrove forests, fish and aquatic resource depletion and land and soil degradation. It is estimated that current food production and consumption patterns account for up to 30% of global greenhouse gas emissions, use 70% of global freshwater resources, and are responsible for a large share of air pollution. Climate change has intensified the frequency and intensity of natural disasters, which have consequences on crops, livestock, fisheries, aquaculture, and forestry, as well as adverse human, social, economic, and environmental impacts. The sustainability of aquatic and agro-food systems is closely linked with prospects for food security, nutrition, biodiversity, resource use, rural livelihoods, and climate change effects. Moreover, there is a correlation between the acuteness of food security challenges and (i) the loss in on-farm agrobiodiversity and (ii) the level of encroachment into biodiversity hotspots, including protected areas. Once all the hitherto hidden social and environmental impacts and dependencies on nature are included in decision-making, enhancing **agrobiodiversity** across the agri-food system can be the best option for food security, for nature, for climate, for pollution mitigation and for sustainable livelihoods. However, despite ongoing efforts, biodiversity is deteriorating worldwide at rates unprecedented in human history. The recent adoption of the Post 2020 Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF) provides renewed impetus to catalyse, enable and galvanize urgent and transformative action to safeguard, share and sustainably use the plant biodiversity that feeds the world. Agrobiodiversity has for a large part been maintained, developed, and preserved by smallholder, family farmers through sustainable, agroecological approaches so they must be placed at the heart of the implementation of the GBF. The Sustainable Development Goals and GBF recognise the critical need to sustainably manage agricultural sectors (GBF target 10), to conserve, exchange and invest in plant genetic resources (GBF target 4), and to expand the mechanisms for benefit-sharing arising from the use of these resources in a fair and equitable manner (GBF target 13). The interventions under Component 1 aim to strengthen the enabling environment at the national level to allow small-scale farmers to safeguard, share and sustainably use plant biodiversity and to deliver global public goods and services as called for by the ITPGRFA and the GBF. Food systems challenges are also closely related to land governance, in particular equitable access to land resources and secure land tenure. Land rights are key to progress on human rights, flourishing and healthy societies, and a sustainable planet. Securing land rights is essential to address the climate crisis and build sustainable and resilient local food systems. However, global commitments towards the preservation of agrobiodiversity and the setting up of equitable and secure land governance are far from being achieved.

In the case of **fisheries**, fish stocks are at risk of collapsing in many parts of the world due to overexploitation. According to FAO<sup>5</sup>, the fraction of fishery stocks within biologically sustainable levels decreased to 64.6 % in 2019, 1.2% lower than in 2017 (90% in 1974). In contrast, the percentage of stocks fished at biologically unsustainable levels has been increasing since the late 1970s, from 10% in 1974 to 35.4% in 2019. With reduced catches in the north, developed countries have increased imports from the global south to compensate. Around 75% of resources are now caught in the developing world<sup>6</sup>, which is intensifying the pressure on fisheries in that part of the planet. This growing extinction threat undermines food and nutrition security and livelihoods especially in LDCs where fish are a vital source of nourishment. More and more attention is now being given to aquatic food products as a source not only of nutrient-rich protein, but also of essential micronutrients such as vitamins and minerals, that can reduce malnutrition among at-risk groups like children and pregnant and lactating women (PLW) and lower the risk of non-communicable diseases. FAO estimates that over 3 billion people get 20% of their animal protein from aquatic foods. In addition, aquatic foods provide significant export revenue for many developing countries, and livelihoods for some 800 million people. The demand for aquatic food is expected to roughly double by 2050 which will most likely be met principally by aquaculture expansion, which is among the fastest growing food sectors. Per capita consumption

<sup>5</sup> The State of World Fisheries and Aquaculture 2022

<sup>6</sup> Ending fishery overexploitation by expanding from local successes to globalized solutions



of aquatic foods will increase in all regions except Africa where it is expected to decrease, in particular in Sub Saharan Africa. If historical trends are maintained, growth of aquaculture and fisheries in Africa would be slow, resulting in declining per capita fish consumption. Although sustainable aquaculture that uses alternative feeds, improvements in processing technologies, and focuses on low-trophic species preventing competition with aquatic food for human

Consumption, has great potential to feed and nourish the growing population of the global south, aquaculture expansion in LDCs remains limited due to the high capital investment needed for equipment, feeding, capacity building and increasing its resilience against climate, biological and financial risks. These challenges call for the development of innovative **aquatic food value chains** that sustainably increase the production of affordable aquatic foods with high nutritional value to local people, provide economic benefits to local communities and minimise food loss and waste through improved use of by-products along the value chains, in line with the new FAO Guidelines for Sustainable Aquaculture (GSA)<sup>7</sup>. The fact that well managed fisheries and sustainable aquaculture have far lower emission intensity compared to terrestrial livestock should also be considered. The world is not on track towards ensuring access to **safe, nutritious and sufficient food** for all people all year round (SDG Target 2.1), or to eradicating all forms of malnutrition (SDG Target 2.2). Conflict, climate variability and extremes, and economic slowdowns/downturns are the major drivers slowing progress, particularly where inequality is high. The COVID-19 pandemic has made the pathway towards SDG2 even steeper; although enough food is produced to feed the world's population, hunger and malnutrition are on the rise. The number of people affected by hunger globally rose to 828 million in 2021, an increase of about 46 million since 2020 and 150 million since the outbreak of COVID-19<sup>8</sup>. After remaining relatively unchanged since 2015, the proportion of people affected by hunger jumped in 2020 and continued to rise in 2021, to 9.8% of the world population. This compares with 8% in 2019 and 9.3% in 2020. The Global Report on Food Crises (2023) estimates that in 2022 over a quarter of a billion people were acutely food-insecure and required urgent food assistance in 58 countries. No region of the world has been spared by these trends though the prevalence of hunger and malnutrition is generally higher in conflict-affected, chronically poor, and indigenous communities, with women and children being the most exposed to food insecurity and malnutrition, suffering long-lasting consequences and affecting their development potential. This is also linked to historical marginalisation, lack of land rights and invasion of indigenous lands for mono-cultivation, extractive industries, etc. Persons with disabilities, and especially children, are also at increased risk of malnutrition and food insecurity; in 2020, an estimated 45 million children under the age of five were suffering from wasting, the deadliest form of malnutrition, while 49 million children under the age of five had stunted growth and development due to a chronic lack of essential nutrients in their diets. In addition, poverty and food insecurity are the main drivers of child labour; 70% of child labour occurs in agriculture: 112 million children are engaged in child labour in crop farming, livestock, forestry, fisheries and aquaculture, mostly in small-scale farming, where the majority are children as young as 5-11 years, half of them in hazardous conditions. At the same time there are high rates of youth unemployment and underemployment, and high levels of indebtedness among certain groups of farmers, due to high seed and fertiliser dependency. Furthermore, an estimated 500 million smallholder farmers in Asia, Africa and Latin America are at risk from **crop pests** caused by insects, pathogens (including fungi, bacteria, viruses, nematodes) and weeds, and other threats to food and nutrition security and food safety. Worldwide, an estimated 40% of crops are lost due to pests. Invasive alien species are one of the biggest causes of biodiversity loss and species extinction. There is a rapid emergence of new invasive species (e.g., Fall Armyworm, Tomato Leafminer, Black Stemrust (UG99)), and ongoing transboundary pest threats (e.g., Banana Fusarium Wilt (TR4), Citrus Greening, Asian Fruit Fly), driven by climate change and the global movement of goods. Climate change facilitates the spread and establishment of pests and alien species and creates new opportunities for them to become invasive. In developing countries, food safety, animal and plant health monitoring and management system are under pressure to cope with these emerging threats. This calls for the development of targeted information resources that enable systematic and effective responses at farm level, thereby enhancing the resilience of male and female farmers to pest shocks in agriculture and the effects of climate change. Women are key in ensuring food security for their families and communities - considering their role as food producers and providers - and yet women and girls suffer the heaviest impact of climate shocks, inequalities, and food insecurity. Reversing these trends and achieving SDG 2 will require the allocation of additional and well-targeted resources, otherwise food crises will become even more frequent, protracted, and severe. As noted by the Global Report on Food Crises (GRFC), the immediate drivers of food crises include conflicts, weather extremes and economic shocks. Food crises are the acute manifestation of the structural dysfunctions of current aquatic and agri-food systems, compounded by low public spending, market failures, and deficiencies in the governance mechanisms at global, regional and national levels. Inequalities in income, social protection, gender, disability, social status and age, as well as geographic location, exacerbate the vulnerabilities to food and nutrition insecurity of specific populations, even more so in times of global shocks such as the enduring COVID-19 pandemic and the war in

<sup>7</sup> GSA - Guidelines for Sustainable Aquaculture: <https://www.fao.org/in-action/gsa/background/zh/> [Accessed on 13/09/2023]

<sup>8</sup> The 2022 edition of The State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World (SOFI) report

Ukraine. The challenges described above are multidimensional and interrelated, and therefore require the adoption of a system-based approach that considers the interrelations between the different elements across the food system, rather than focusing on one or a limited subset of food system components in isolation. A holistic approach, promoting systemic changes that concurrently address the main drivers of risks, in particular in fragile countries affected by protracted crises, is therefore required. In 2021, the UN Secretary General convened the first **Food Systems Summit (FSS)**. The FSS put food systems transformation at the centre of creating renewed momentum to achieve the goals of Agenda 2030 and the Paris Agreement. In the process of preparing for the FSS, widespread discussions and consultations took place from the local to the global level. New ways of working brought stakeholders together and triggered a multitude of proposals for action. At country level, national pathways for the transformation of food systems were developed. Thematically, a number of Coalitions for Action emerged, eight of which were joined by the European Commission. To coordinate the follow-up of the FSS, a UN Food Systems Coordination Hub was established in early 2022 to support countries in implementing food systems transformation pathways towards the achievement of the 2030 Agenda. The Hub acts as a coordinator and a connector among diverse constituencies. It facilitates the identification of support services, while the actual implementation of the services will be done by UN Agencies and other actors of the ‘Ecosystem of Support’. Likewise, the **Nutrition for Growth (N4G) summit** which is traditionally held in the margins of the Olympic Games- a symbol of health, strength, and human potential-, brings together country governments, donors, and other stakeholders to mobilize new policy and financial commitments to position nutrition as an essential development priority. It aims to contribute to the achievement of the global nutrition targets by 2025. At the first N4G Summit in 2013, the EU pledged to allocate €3.5 billion between 2014–2020 to improve nutrition in partner countries. By 2020, this commitment had not only been achieved but was surpassed by €800 million. France will organise the next N4G summit in 2024/2025, with support from the EU in a Team Europe approach. The **Global Nutrition Report (GNR)** tracks nutrition stakeholders' commitments made during the N4G summit and progress on nutrition recorded by all the parties involved. This helps to strengthen the accountability of governments and other partners. Following the leadership of France hosting the next N4G, the EU would continue supporting GNR or a similar global nutrition accountability/governance mechanism. The proposed Action (Action 8 of the Prosperity Pillar) aims to support this global transition to inclusive, climate-neutral, resilient, equitable and sustainable food systems, combining a number of related initiatives in a coherent programme, providing synergies with relevant regional and national level programmes, and in particular complementing other EU country-based actions. It has four interrelated components:

1. Fostering agrobiodiversity and sustainable land use
2. New Aquatic Food Value Chains development for sustainable healthy diets for the most vulnerable in fragile contexts (NAVAC)
3. Plant Health
4. Enhancing knowledge-based food systems governance

The proposed Action is fully aligned with the EU Green Deal priority, Agenda 2030, and the European Consensus for Development. It will contribute to various SDG, most notably SDG 2 (Zero Hunger), SDG 1 (poverty), SDG3 (health), SDG 5 (gender equality), SDG 6 (water), SDG 8 (decent work), SDG 12 (sustainable consumption and production), SDG 13 (climate action), SDG 14 (life below water) and SDG 15 (life on land). It will also contribute to the implementation of the EU Gender Action Plan III, notably its priority of: ‘Addressing challenges and harnessing the opportunities offered by the green transition and the digital transformation’.

## 2.2 Problem Analysis

Agri-food systems impact on most aspects of the SDGs and Small-Scale Producers (SSP) are at the heart of them. Agri-food Research and Innovation (R&I) is supposed to deliver solutions that benefit agri-food systems and SSPs, but de facto, R&I systems have limited and usually isolated success in involving and in positively impacting the livelihoods of SSPs around the world. The root of this problem is two-fold: a). the lack of inclusion in R&I systems of main actors in the design and priority setting of R&I programmes and projects, with national agricultural research systems (NARS) in particular lacking capacities and resources to promote a strong global voice and b). SSPs don't have the opportunities and capacity to take part in the design and priority setting of R&I programmes and projects. R&I projects and programmes, although nominally addressing SSPs' needs, are therefore often not relevant and appropriate to SSPs and not sustainable because they are not ‘owned’ by them. Simplistic linear approaches (R&I ‘delivering’ innovations that end-users are supposed to ‘adopt’) are not adequate to address this problem. They need to be overcome by up-stream transformations in the research approaches and ‘rules of the game’ that shape interactions among different stakeholders towards more effective, equitable and socially grounded processes to generate solutions with and for poor SSPs. One of the interventions envisaged under Component 1 of this Action



specifically addresses this issue by proposing inclusive integrated partnerships with SSPs to strengthen research and innovation in the transformation of agri-food systems, with a particular emphasis on **agrobiodiversity**. A complementary intervention proposes an ‘action research’ approach to support farmers’ management of and access to agro-biodiversity and to generate global knowledge for addressing common challenges and accelerating the implementation of the ITPGRFA and GBF. Furthermore, unsustainable food systems are also one of the main drivers of biodiversity loss. A recent article in Nature Food which sets out a composite Agrobiodiversity Index reveals a low global mean agrobiodiversity commitment score (21.4 out of 100), indicating that much stronger commitments and concrete actions are needed to enhance agrobiodiversity across agri-food systems. This commitment and concrete actions can be stimulated through an economic valuation of the benefits that agrobiodiversity provides, juxtaposed with the economic losses under Business As Usual (BAU) if agrobiodiversity is depleted. One of the proposed interventions will provide support to partner countries and EU Delegations (EUDs) to make the economic case for mainstreaming policy scenarios that enhance agrobiodiversity, measuring changes in agrobiodiversity commitment over the duration of the Action via up to 10 indicators produced as part of the Agrobiodiversity Index.

In the case of **aquatic value chains**, the main problems to be addressed include the decreasing levels of aquatic food consumption in many LDCs, where the habitual fish consumption by nutritionally vulnerable populations is below recommended amounts. High and increasing rates of nutrient deficiencies across LDCs and the rising numbers (for the fourth consecutive year), of people facing high levels of acute food insecurity, suggest that the diets of many women, children and men are inadequate. The widespread prevalence of overfishing of small pelagic stocks which limits the availability of fish for local consumption combined with climate-driven shifts in species distributions are also expected to further decrease catch potential of small pelagic fish. Another problem to be addressed relates to the livelihoods of coastal/riverine communities; population growth rates continue to increase, while marine resource stocks continue to dwindle. Even where suitable fisheries management systems are in place, there are simply too many people fishing too few fish and this is leading to declining employment, incomes, food security and rural social stability, resulting in increased poverty among coastal communities. Alternative livelihoods are seen as essential for both the development of coastal communities and for the conservation of marine and coastal biodiversity and ecosystems. For coastal communities, particularly in areas where traditional fishing practices are no longer sustainable or reliable, farming of aquatic species, in particular low trophic species such as algae or marine invertebrates are both viable alternative livelihoods in LDC. This intervention aims to significantly expand and scale up the supply of and access to affordable, safe, nutritious aquatic food products, for increased consumption by nutritionally vulnerable populations. At the same time, and in line with work of the FAO on sustainable aquaculture, the expansion of aquaculture should contribute to and not come at the expense of the protection of the ecosystems and biodiversity on which it depends.

In the case of **plant health**, invasive species are demonstrating more flexibility in responding to climate change than native ones and reap the benefits that come with early blooming, such as shading out competitors and capturing a larger share of nutrients, water or pollinators. Response systems are particularly difficult to set-up and remain uncoordinated and cost ineffective. Access to information on sustainable pest and disease management and resources needed for an effective response is limited, in particular for female farmers. As a result, smallholder farmers continue to experience crop and livestock losses from pests and diseases where they rely on under-resourced public extension services alone. Worldwide, an estimated 40% of crops are lost to pests (incl. pathogens and weeds). Private agro-input dealers continue to be a major source of advice to male and female farmers which can lead to over/misuse of plant protection products and veterinarian drugs. The indiscriminate use of highly toxic plant protection products is posing environmental and health risks, which in turn decrease the resilience of land use systems to pests. Interventions are therefore needed to empower both farmers and agro-input dealers on improved pest and disease management practices and supply of safer agricultural and products of animal origins. Uptake of low-risk plant protection products and effective drugs is hindered by their limited availability in local markets mainly due to low demand and regulatory policies on registration and distribution. Inadequate consumer awareness or demand for food produced without risk of contamination from pesticides does not encourage farmers to use low risk pest control products and leads to disincentives for agro-input dealers to invest in these products. This lack of incentives is a barrier to the creation of local markets and businesses for the production of low-risk plant protection products and veterinarian drugs, and compliance with Good Agricultural Practices (GAPs) in domestic food supply systems. Past experiences have shown that projects addressing single problems on single crops are a partial response to a bigger need for a well-functioning, inclusive and responsive plant health system. Addressing this multi-dimensional challenge requires a whole-system approach that considers all actors and functions in the food supply system.

Adequate information provision remains an essential prerequisite for enhanced **food systems governance**. The **Agricultural Market Information System (AMIS)** aims to enhance food market transparency and policy responses for food security. Enhanced market transparency will reduce food price volatility. AMIS was launched in 2011 by the G20 Ministers of Agriculture in response to the global food price hikes in 2007/08 and 2010. Bringing together

the principal trading countries of agricultural commodities, AMIS assesses global food supplies (focusing on wheat, maize, rice and soybeans) and provides a platform to coordinate policy action in times of market uncertainty. Following up to the 2021 Food Systems Summit, the **UN Food Systems Coordination Hub** will foster food systems change at global and national levels. It aims to enhance the global coordination of support for the implementation of food systems transformation in partner countries; catalyse actions in support of implementation of selected national food systems transformation pathways; connect science and knowledge communities with policy making and investment prioritisation, linking global and national levels and foster the shift towards a new Food Finance Architecture. In the case of **nutrition governance**, ending malnutrition in all its forms remains a global challenge as at least 1 out of 3 children globally is affected by some form of malnutrition. Nutrition is a fundamentally multi-sectoral issue, which needs to be tackled on several fronts, including health, education, WASH, agriculture and social protection. It is therefore crucial to seize opportunities for mainstreaming nutrition in the initiatives supported within the framework of the Green Deal priority areas to fight malnutrition effectively (such as the Great Green Wall in the greater Sahel region of Africa). Better global nutrition governance will push for clear commitments by the concerned stakeholders and initiatives based on the proper use of nutrition data at national level in partner countries will help to ensure concrete, well targeted actions in the field of nutrition. Timely and quality data with an adequate level of disaggregation are essential to guide country choices to allocate resources and to monitor progress in nutrition. Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS), Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys (MICS) or national nutrition surveys are the major sources of nutrition data for many countries, but they are complex and expensive undertakings that cannot be implemented with the required frequency. **National Information Platforms for Nutrition (NIPN) and Nutrition Information Systems (NIS)** are two EU supported interventions developed for the production and use of nutrition data at national level in partner countries. NIPN are rooted within existing institutions and national multisectoral coordination systems for nutrition. From the analysis of available and shared data, they generate evidence that is used by (sub-)national stakeholders for developing policy, designing programmes, and allocating investments. NIS aims at supporting partner countries in strengthening their national nutrition information systems and their analytical capacities as regards nutrition. NIPN is implemented in 8 (soon to be 9 countries) while NIS is implemented in 5 countries (which are also covered by NIPN in 4, soon to be 5 countries). Considering the positive results obtained with both programmes but also potential overlaps in their objectives, it is proposed to assess merging some of their activities by setting up a transitional phase before envisaging a new common/joint phase. In order to prioritize the allocation of limited resources for food crises prevention and management, the production of reliable and consensual data is essential. The Global Network against Food Crisis (GNAFC) aims to prevent, prepare, and respond to food crisis, reducing needs, risks and vulnerabilities associated with acute hunger. It notably promotes neutral and consensus-based information and analysis, strategic evidence-based and coherent investments in food security and nutrition and increases collaboration and coordination between agencies, institutions to holistically address food crises. The International Phase Classification (**IPC**<sup>9</sup>), supported through the GNAFC is the reference to inform on the status of acute food insecurity across the globe and its drivers. However, the current geographic coverage does not provide a complete picture of the state of food insecurity in the world and there is a need to better understand structural causes to address them. Support under this intervention will contribute to improving the coverage and the understanding of the causes of hunger, and hence the quality of the GRFC and its capacity to make recommendations for long-term changes. In addition, the implementation of IPC makes it possible to strengthen coordination around the understanding of food crises drivers and the responses to be provided in affected countries. Complementarities with relevant actions at geographic level should be ensured. At the same time, there are numerous opportunities to be seized, for instance related to the digital transformation, which will create new possibilities for improving and expanding the analysis of food security, from data collection to communication of the results. **JRC** plays a key role in the writing of the Global Report on Food Crises (GNAFC) and assures the peer review / quality check on data and analysis for the EU. Moreover, the JRC provides quality information and analysis on selected food security themes and develops macro- and microeconomic modelling, making use of digital and earth observation capacities and analysis. It operates the EU knowledge centre on global food security. Finally, participating in the **GDPRD** allows the European Commission to systematically engage with other donors from around the world, with a view to enhancing the impact of donor policies, investments and interventions related to food systems and rural development.

Identification of **main stakeholders** and corresponding institutional and/or organisational issues (mandates, potential roles, and capacities) to be covered by the action:

A broad range of stakeholders are involved in the diverse interventions supported by this Action including partner governments, local authorities, farmers (and their various organisations/associations), indigenous and local communities, international organisations, civil society, including women and youth organisations, researchers,

<sup>9</sup> <https://www.ipcinfo.org/> [Accessed on 13/09/2023]

breeders, academia, environmental institutions, the seed sector, media, national gene banks and food processing industries.

The main implementing partners for each intervention are as follows:

#### Agrobiodiversity

The Global Forum on Agricultural Research and Innovation (GFAR) is global multi-stakeholder platform driven by 900+ members, all actors in agricultural Research and Innovation (R&I) from 13 different constituencies.

FAO in support of the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRFA) which is an international agreement aligned with the Convention on Biological Diversity, which aims at guaranteeing food security through the conservation, exchange and sustainable use of the world's plant genetic resources for food and agriculture (PGRFA), the fair and equitable benefit sharing arising from its use, as well as the recognition of farmers' rights. It was signed in 2001 in Madrid and entered into force on 29 June 2004. There are 148 contracting parties to the Plant Treaty (147 Member States plus the EU) as of November 2020 and

United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP) has experience and expertise on e the economics of ecosystems and biodiversity as part of the UNEP-TEEB, then UNEP-TEEB AGRIFOOD interventions.

#### New Aquatic food Value Chains (NAVAC)

The Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO)

#### Plant Health

The Centre for Agriculture and Bioscience International (CABI)

#### Food System Governance

FAO for the Agricultural Market Information System (AMIS)

FAO for the Food System Summit (FSS) follow up

GIZ for C4N and global support of NIPN and implementation of NIPN in 2/3 countries (Ethiopia, Niger and soon in Zambia)

United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) for the implementation of NIPN in 5 countries and the implementation of NIS in 5 countries,

The World Health Organisation (WHO) for the implementation of NIS in partnership with UNICEF in 5 countries,

The Tropical Agricultural Research and Higher Education Centre (CATIE) in charge of 1 NIPN country.

The French authorities (Ministry of Foreign affairs) for the Nutrition for Growth (N4G) summit which should take place in 2024.

FAO and the World Food Programme (WFP), (and potentially UNICEF) jointly responsible for the implementation of the GNAFC including IPC

The DG Joint Research Centre (JRC) for food security data and analyses

The International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) for the Global Donor Platform for Rural Development (GDPRD)

## 3. DESCRIPTION OF THE ACTION

### 3.1 Objectives and Expected Outputs

The proposed Action aims to contribute to MIP Specific Objective 6: Transition towards resilient and sustainable agri-food systems.

The **Overall Objective (OO)** is to accelerate the transition to inclusive, climate-neutral, resilient, and sustainable agri-aquatic food systems.

The **Specific Objectives** of this action are:

SO1: Enhanced agrobiodiversity and equitable land governance

SO2: Increased availability and accessibility of nutritious and safe and sustainable aquatic foods for vulnerable populations (including those in countries in fragile contexts)

SO3: Improved food safety

SO4: Improved evidence-based food systems governance

Outputs related to SO1 include:

OP1.1 Partnership Principles (PPs) established as a global standard

OP1.2 Partnerships for impact implemented brokering knowledge (systems)

OP1.3 Collective Actions (CAs) related to agrobiodiversity and sustainable agri-food systems

OP1.4 Knowledge, Data and Evidence (KDE) generated by Knowledge and Learning Hubs (KLHs)

OP1.5 PGRFA managed or improved with farmers' participation

OP1.6 Enhanced local value chains improve the production and consumption of adapted PGRFA

OP1.7 Mechanisms strengthened to enhance the sharing of PGRFA materials, data and knowledge

OP1.8 Increased awareness on global action and innovative multilateral governance underpinned by the International Treaty and its global partners

OP1.9. Selection of policy scenarios and suite of up to 10 agrobiodiversity indicators.

OP1.10 TEEB AgriFood Framework assessments of each policy scenario.

OP1.11 Promotional material to encourage adoption of policy scenarios

OP1.12 Increased empowerment of land governance networks

OP1.13 Increased capacities of smallholder farmers to manage agroecological farms with equitable land tenure and agrobiodiversity

Outputs related to SO2 include:

OP2.1 Improved knowledge on the potential of aquatic food products and their by-products, originating from effectively managed fisheries and sustainable aquaculture, in the formulation of highly nutritious, accessible, and affordable food.

OP2.2 Safe, nutrition-dense, low-cost, stable food products (prototype food products) made from sustainable aquatic food and/or their by-products that are specifically tailored to address malnutrition among children, PLW and vulnerable populations in countries in fragile contexts are developed.

OP2.3 The supply and demand of new sustainable aquatic food and by-products strategies and pilot tests implemented in at least 3 countries.

OP2.4 Regulatory frameworks adapted

OP2.5 Business development supported

OP2.6 Newly developed aquatic food products promoted

OP2.7 New aquatic food products from effectively managed fisheries and sustainable aquaculture are integrated into school feeding programmes, such as Home-Grown School Feeding (HGSF), and other institutional food programmes.

Outputs related to SO3 include:

OP3.1 Strengthened systems for the detection and response to pest outbreaks

OP3.2. Enhanced knowledge of climate-smart plant health practices

OP3.3 Increased capacities and systems for the local production and distribution of low-risk plant protection products

OP3.4 Increased engagement of regulators to register low-risk plant protection products (with a focus on specific crops)

OP3.5 Agricultural service providers equipped with new digital learning products and decision-making tools

OP3.6 Improved provision of gender sensitive agricultural extension services

Outputs related to SO4 include

OP4.1 AMIS Market Monitor – assessing the global market situation and outlook for the AMIS crops.

OP4.2 AMIS Indicator Portal – featuring key measures to identify critical market conditions that might require policy action.

OP4.3 AMIS Market Database – providing the latest forecasts on production, consumption, trade and stocks

OP4.4 AMIS Policy Database – compiling information on policies that might impact on global food markets.

OP4.5 Food Systems Solutions Library developed

OP4.6 Country Support Portfolios co-designed, linking public and private funding and shifting the financing landscape

OP4.7 Food Systems Science Policy briefs developed

OP4.8 Interaction between the Ecosystem of Support (including Coalitions) and countries institutionalised and enhanced

OP4.9 Strengthened commitments made by the nutrition stakeholders at global level during the next N4G followed up by a global nutrition accountability/governance mechanism.

OP4.10 Improved collection of nutrition data at local and national level for consistent use in the establishment of national strategies to fight malnutrition.

OP4.11 Proposal for a joint NIPN/ NIS programme to be put in place at the end of both contracts

OP4.12 Enhanced partnership between GNAFC Members to ensure better prevention and response to food crises, in a humanitarian-development-peace nexus approach;

OP4.13 GNAFC analytical products are regularly prepared and disseminated.

OP4.14 The IPC governance structure, collaboration and ownership by partner regions/countries are elevated, strengthened and expanded

OP4.15 Cutting-edge, advanced technologies are incorporated to make IPC an agile system built on innovation

OP4.16 Improved collection of food security data at local and national level for consistent use in the establishment of national/ regional / global strategies to fight hunger. Food security monitoring systems (incl through IPC) are implemented to provide timely information and predictive analytical approaches for decision making at national, regional and global levels (fulfilment of data gap)

OP4.17. The GNAFC enhance strategic programming along the HDP nexus to better address food crisis (strategic links established between actors, joint context analysis, joint agreed outcomes).

OP4.18 Scientific evidence made available

OP4.19 increased capacities and knowledge sharing with international organisations and through partnerships in Africa.

OP4.20 Production of data to support implementation of new EU regulations.

OP4.21 Provision of a JRC Knowledge Centre for Global Food and Nutrition Security.

OP4.22 Donor roundtables for working together and sharing experience and knowledge

OP4.23 Research on enhanced donor effectiveness and coordination at country level

OP4.24 Recommendations Database for Food Systems and Knowledge Hubs for Thematic Areas

### 3.2 Indicative Activities

#### **Activities related to SO1 (OP1.1 to OP1.4)**

Promotion of the Partnership Principles (PPs) as a ‘grid’ or common standard to assess the quality of research initiatives.

Facilitating partnerships and acting as knowledge broker among diverse stakeholders providing programs and projects with improved outreach, legitimacy and sustainability via a more transparent, coherent, decentralized governance structures and processes as well as stronger constituency representation and participation.

## Setting up of Collective Actions

Generation and sharing of Knowledge, Data and Evidence (KDE) through dynamic exchanges about relevant areas and topics of common interest of GFAR's 900+ members.

### **Activities related to SO1 (OP1.5 to OP1.8)**

Upscale successful, transformative biodiversity-friendly practices

Strengthen global mechanisms and policy mainstreaming

Building a strong knowledge-sharing global community

Advocacy and Outreach to target audiences

### **Activities related to SO1 (OP1.9 to OP1.13)**

Country selection, prioritization, sensitization:

In-country stakeholder consultation: Participatory discussion on the selection of viable policy scenarios that would contribute to enhancing agrobiodiversity; stakeholder mapping; establishment of in-country Project Steering Committee(s).

Selection of policy scenarios and suite of up to 10 agrobiodiversity indicators, including contracting of in-country host research entity/consortium and involving international research entities when relevant.

TEEB AgriFood Framework assessment of each policy scenario: using economic valuations to model the benefits of policy shifts versus the BAU counterfactual.

Mainstreaming and communication: providing targeted reports and materials to in-country stakeholders as well EUDs to promote adoption of the policy scenarios that improve agrobiodiversity.

Monitoring of outcomes: assessment of the intervention's impact vis-à-vis suite of up to 10 agrobiodiversity indicators that have been selected and agreed upon for each country.

Analysis of land tenure situation in regions and countries

Advocacy and policy work for improving land governance systems at global, regional and national levels

Organisation of wide capacity-building actions on agroecological approaches, preservation of agrobiodiversity and securing equitable land tenure rights

Ensure representation of smallholder and family farmers in key international fora

Raise awareness and inform widely on land tenure challenges, agroecological approaches and agrobiodiversity, as well as on the vital role of smallholder and family farmers in this context, including on the situation of women and indigenous groups.

### **Activities related to SO2 (OP2.1 to OP2.7)**

Research, identification and mapping of local/native aquatic products with high nutrition potential, with specific emphasis on innovation (algae, invertebrates, underutilised dryland fisheries, fish by-products,...) and sustainability.

Research on nutrient content and sensory evaluation of aquatic foods and their by-products to ensure their acceptability and nutritional value

Sustainability assessment of the new aquatic food VCs in terms of its economic, social and environmental impacts, and to identify critical sustainability issues (hotspots). Development of a database and knowledge sharing platform on nutrient content of various sustainable aquatic food and their by-products

Development and pilot-testing of different aquatic food products based on underutilised sustainable aquatic resources and low-trophic species, including algae or invertebrates such as molluscs, dryland fisheries and fish by-products, to assess technical production feasibility and shelf life, including for indirect human consumption.

Standardisation of small and medium scale production processes and characterisation (nutrition, physical-chemical and sensory analyses) of the new aquatic food products

Design technical guidelines and best practice manuals for each production process to ensure their environmental sustainability, including, in particular, integrated multi-trophic aquaculture and production processes combining aquatic food production and agriculture (e.g. fish-rice farming).



Development of resilient and sustainable aquatic food product value chains to increase the availability and accessibility of nutritious and safe aquatic foods to vulnerable populations (including those in countries in fragile contexts), by focusing in particular on small scale fisheries and aquaculture as part of social, economic and environmental resilience strategies.

Establishment of value chain multi stakeholder partnerships to support the aquatic food VC development

Participatory value chain analysis (including value chain mapping) and development of upgrading strategies to enhance market driven aquatic by-product supply

Run local pilot projects to test the technical and financial feasibility, acceptability and scalability of the new food products and development of sustainable business models for the aquatic food products developed

Participatory review of legal and regulatory framework for aquatic foods and fish by products

Development of legal roadmap to ensure a conducive legal environment

Capacity building of various administrations and institutions involved in the management of the new value chains

Capacity building for VC actors on upgraded business models and market access/requirements including institutional markets (public enterprises, schools, administrations,...)

Organisation of brokering initiatives and events bringing VC actors and potential customers/investors together

Organisation of VC exchange and innovation workshops aimed at generating new ideas for new products

Develop/adapt resource management plans to ensure economic, social and environmental sustainability of production processes

Stakeholder organisational capacity building, with specific emphasis on VC integration of women and young people

Monitoring the performance of the value chain development process, including of the new food products in the market and evaluating their nutritional impact on the target population (PLW and children) as well as their contribution to increasing the sustainability and resilience of food systems.

Assess and test consumer preferences and acceptability for a variety of sustainable new aquatic food products (global and local levels)

Propose marketing strategies in line with consumer preferences

Development of communication campaigns

Organisation of fairs or support presentation of new products in existing fairs

Integration of the new aquatic food products into school feeding programmes, as HGSF and other institutional feeding programmes.

Development of recipes for the new aquatic food products based on local diets and traditions and conduct acceptability trials

Development of strategies and best practice manuals to incorporate the new aquatic food products in schools and other governmental institutions.

#### **Activities related to SO3: (OP3.1 to 3.6)<sup>10</sup>**

Apply tools and models for identifying and assessing risks of new and endemic pests

Develop and deploy tools and processes for general surveillance and specific surveys for pests

Establish mechanism for decision making and stakeholder coordination on pest prevention, preparedness, and management

Co-develop national prevention and management plans for high-risk priority pests

Develop awareness raising and communication campaigns on management and control of prioritized pests

Monitor and evaluate implementation of pest prevention and management plans

<sup>10</sup> The majority of these activities will take place on the country level. Those that will take place on the global level are identified as such.

Integrate IPM training into an existing mandatory licensing scheme to sell agricultural products (or contribute to new ones)

Develop voluntary certification scheme for agro-input dealers around enhanced IPM and pest risk reduction, with accompanying business models (Global)

Identify constraints in policy regimes that hinder registration of low-risk plant protection products

Sensitise relevant actors/stakeholders on the need to promote low-risk plant protection and work with regulatory agencies to revise regulations for low-risk products

Analyse potential impact of withdrawal of high-risk plant protection products from the market and identify available alternatives

Design and implement campaigns to increase demand for safer food

Identify specific pest/solution/technologies relevant for a local community

Set up pilot facilities in collaboration with crop protection departments or research organisations

Adoption of innovative ways to reach women farmers by agriculture input suppliers

Create further employment opportunities for young men and women entrepreneurs by establishing additional production facilities

Organise existing or new common interest groups of farmers into groups/producer clubs

Develop an achievable voluntary production standard relating to safer food

Enable farmers to meet voluntary production standards and access higher value markets

Engage with policy makers including those involved in regulation of biopesticides/pesticides and monitoring MRLs

Assess existing rural and peri-urban employment initiatives to explore job opportunities in producer-oriented agricultural service provision (Global)

Develop and test business models for employment opportunities for producer-oriented service provision (Global)

Build capacity of young men and women as agricultural service providers

Equip additional users in existing and new partner organisations and in other countries with digital learning products and decision-making tools

Conduct an assessment in programme countries using the Gender and Rural Advisor Services assessment Tool (GRAST)

Develop advocacy messages and develop and implement training that help to improve the gender sensitivity of agricultural advisory services.

#### **Activities related to SO4:**

##### **AMIS (related to Outputs 4.1 to 4.4)**

Capacity building – supporting countries to produce better market information

AMIS participants collaborate with the Secretariat to provide monthly updates of the market situation

The Secretariat produces regular market outlooks, carries out independent data validation, strengthens national capacities for market assessments and facilitates the interaction between focal points.

In the event of market instability, the Rapid Response Forum of AMIS coordinates appropriate policy measures

##### **FSS follow up (related to Outputs 4.5 to 4.8)**

Support countries to assess their needs and co-design Country Support Portfolios

Develop (selected) country-level financing packages according to the new Food Financing Architecture

Compile science-based evidence for food systems transformation to inform policy making and enhance the science-policy interface

Facilitate and enhance connections and information flows between Coalitions/Ecosystem of Support and countries

##### **Nutrition (related to Outputs 4.9 to 4.11)**

Support to improved collection of nutrition data at local and national level

Evaluation(s) of NIPN (phase II), NIS and other relevant nutrition programmes

Preparation of a common programme NIPN/ NIS for transition at the end of both contracts

Support to a global nutrition accountability/governance mechanism to ensure the follow-up of pledges made during the N4G summit

Support to the organisation of the next N4G summit in France

#### **GNAFC / IPC (related to Outputs 4.12 to 4.17)**

Key publications and events on food crisis prevention and mitigation

High level executive IPC committee established and effective

New data sources / countries incorporated in the IPC analysis process

Advanced technologies, machine learning and/or AI features tested for potential integration into IPC processes

New data sources incorporated in the IPC Platform and New food crises countries carrying out IPC analysis

IPC experts and practitioners trained, and technical expertise made available in new countries/regions

Country-led initiatives promoting coordination across the HDP Nexus, policy dialogue and advocacy

Peer review / quality checks and contributions to the Global Report on Food crises (and others) - food security in urban areas will receive specific attention.

#### **SESAFS (related to Outputs 4.18 to 4.21)**

Economic data and models, earth observation and geospatial data, and innovative methods including machine learning and artificial intelligence.

Long and short-term ad-hoc studies and analysis as well as Technical Assistance support to specific initiatives.

Capacity building and knowledge sharing with international organisations and through partnerships in Africa.

Production of data to support implementation of new EU regulations

Provision of a JRC Global Knowledge Centre on Food and Nutrition Security.

#### **GDPRD (related to Outputs 4.22 to 4.24)**

Strategic influencing

Knowledge sharing

Networking and convening

### **3.3 Mainstreaming**

Gender, the respect of Human Rights (including the Right to Food) and the Rights of Indigenous people including in relation to their indigenous food systems, are prominent cross-cutting elements of the interventions covered by this Action. Women and children are specifically targeted by various interventions as are persons with disabilities. Women's empowerment is also key to tackle child labour. As child labour is highly prevalent in agriculture, through relevant cross-cutting activities and an integrated approach, the Action will target smallholder farming where most child labour occurs, and other medium scale farms where children and adolescents are involved in labour and in hazardous conditions. The Action is aligned with a human rights-based approach and supports knowledge and evidence on food security and food systems sustainability as a global public good. Moreover, an agroecological approach in food systems transformation favours the use of natural processes and stresses the importance of local knowledge and participatory processes that develop knowledge and practice through experience, as well as scientific methods, and the need to address social inequalities. Environmental, climate and biodiversity concerns will be actively addressed through the promotion of sustainable agri-food systems that contribute to climate change mitigation and adaptation, the sustainable management of natural resources and the preservation or enhancement of (agro-)biodiversity.

#### **Environmental Protection & Climate Change**

##### **Outcomes of the SEA screening**

In line with the mainstreaming guidelines and the five questions for SEA screening, the carrying out of a detailed SEA is not justified. As a general principle, the action seeks to ensure that SAAFS bring a positive contribution to addressing the climate and environmental challenges. The proposed intervention integrates climate and environmental concerns in its design and seeks to bring a meaningful contribution to improve the state of the environment. The programme objectives do not directly and significantly depend on the availability of scarce natural resources for their achievement – on the contrary, the programme seeks to improve – even if indirectly for some of its components - the sustainable management of - and access to natural resources, the building of better resilience to climate change (through for example diversification, agroecological approaches, soil restoration, water harvesting etc.) and a contribution to reducing greenhouse gases emissions (for example through reduced use of external, GHG intensive inputs, application of circular economy principles) in the SAAFS area. No significant cumulative environmental impacts are expected from the envisaged interventions. And finally, the implementation of the initiatives will not promote large-scale use of environmentally damaging substances – on the contrary, by promoting a shift towards Sustainable Agri and Aquatic Food Systems, several of the interventions envisaged in this Action Document aim to address environmental concerns e.g., by addressing agrobiodiversity, the various interventions will address a key constituent of climate change mitigation and adaptation.

### **Result of EIA screening**

None of the envisaged projects under this proposal fall under category A. Some relate to ‘B-type’ actions for EIA screening (not requiring an EIA, but for which environment aspects will be addressed during design). One of the activities deals with plant health, with a focus on identifying and promoting sustainable and environmentally smart solutions to improve plant health and address potential diseases.

The majority of actions envisaged fall under category C, such as Institutional support; Training and capacity development; Awareness raising activities; Development of services; 6. Development/review of policy, regulations, standards, etc. However, supporting value-chains with a commercial approach, even if in a sustainable way, might have environmental impact or impact on natural resources and biodiversity: these will be carefully assessed during design and implementation phases.

### **Result of the Climate Risk Assessment**

The Climate Risk Assessment (CRA) screening shows that the proposed activities are related to the agri-food sector and focus on the transformation towards sustainable food systems. Some of the proposed activities may be affected by drought, floods, heatwaves and/or shifts in the main climatic patterns. The problem analysis explicitly demonstrates awareness of climate risks and their potential for negative impact. In addition, the project description foresees specific measures to strengthen resilience and reduce vulnerability including by adopting agroecological approaches, improving knowledge related to climate risks and pests (e.g., capacity building/training/awareness raising, stakeholder engagement), and notably targeting vulnerable groups. Nevertheless, the potential climate risks and their impact on the ability of some of the actions to achieve their results call for careful assessment of such risks, and design of appropriate risk mitigation measures, when further designing the activities.

### **Gender equality and empowerment of women and girls**

As per OECD Gender DAC codes identified in section 1.1, this Action is labelled as G1 which implies that gender equality is a significant objective. Each of the interventions covered under this Action aim to address gender inequality in one form or another. Each intervention will be asked to assess its potential contribution to the objectives and priority areas of the EU Gender Action Plan III and to the implementation of the CFS’ workstream on gender equality<sup>11</sup>[\[11\]](https://www.fao.org/cfs/workingspace/workstreams/gender/vn/) and women’s and girls’ empowerment. More specifically each intervention will explore the possibility to adopt rights based and transformative approaches and will assess the relevance and possibility to engage with the GAP III’s six areas of engagement (economic and social rights and empowerment; equal participation and leadership; women, peace and security; green and digital transformations; ending gender-based violence; sexual and reproductive health and rights;) and report annually on these aspects in order to contribute to the EU annual reporting on GAP III.

In the case of agrobiodiversity, GFAR has a dedicated constituency for women’s organisations in food and agriculture to tackle gender inequalities that the intervention will work with to develop and implement a gender-transformative approach<sup>12</sup>. The intervention will, inter alia, give special attention to combat discriminatory practices and ensure equal opportunities and participation for both men and women. This will also imply identifying and disseminating gender-responsive and gender-transformative practices and technologies, including labour-saving technologies to reduce

<sup>11</sup> <https://www.fao.org/cfs/workingspace/workstreams/gender/vn/> [Accessed on 13/09/2023]

<sup>12</sup> It also has a dedicated constituency for youth organisations

women's work burden, and to integrate women and gender issues in the development of regional or national strategies, plans and programmes. In the case of Plant Health, deliberate initiatives to engage women and youth in different value chain functions (e.g., agro-enterprises, advisory) are planned. The intervention will work with partners to provide complementary training and tools that support women and youth to benefit from employment opportunities created in the delivery of advisory service. In the case of Component 2 (New Aquatic Value Chains - NAVAC), the gender equality dimension will be incorporated into the value chain development approach by emphasising gender inclusion and women's empowerment. Women in developing countries play an important role in the small-scale fisheries and aquaculture post-harvest sector. Due consideration of their specific roles, needs and interests will be given in each value chain analysis which in turn will inform the choice of the appropriate interventions to address gender related challenges linked to access to production resources, knowledge and technologies, markets, and credit as well as economic empowerment. Activities will reinforce the involvement and the participation of women who are important value chain actors. In addition, established networks of women in fish processing/trade especially in Africa will be important stakeholders during implementation. With respect to nutrition governance and data use, all planned interventions push for equality of access for women. Sex-disaggregated data and gender-sensitive indicators will be used in all components of the action. The interventions will also promote women and women's organisations' active and meaningful participation in the solutions to food insecurity, recognising the central role that women and girls have in food systems.

### **Human Rights**

In line with the EU consensus on development 'our World, our Dignity, our Future' and the 2030 Agenda, the EU uses a rights-based approach as a working methodology. A rights-based approach underpins all of the interventions covered by this Action, through the promotion of ownership, transparency and accountability, and inclusive partnerships. The prioritisation of improved governance on the one hand (the duty bearers) and the rights of women, children, and other groups in vulnerable situations on the other (the rights holders), is a core feature of the different initiatives e.g., in the case of the GNAFC/IPC extension, the right to food is addressed by ensuring that the alert is raised about the magnitude and severity of food crises and populations deprived of this fundamental right, and by facilitating informed responses to those crises. In the case of New Aquatic Value Chains (NAVAC), a human rights-based approach will be applied by ensuring respect of all human rights, participation, non-discrimination, accountability, and transparency in all phases. During implementation, this will be supported by the participation of local communities at all levels including in the planning, implementation, monitoring, and management of pilot projects; intended economic, social and environmental benefits in terms of food security and nutrition, health and sustainable management of local natural assets; the recognition of the role of women in the supported value chains and pro-active consideration of women in decision-making processes.

### **Disability**

As per OECD Disability DAC codes identified in section 1.1, this action is labelled as D0 as it doesn't directly target persons with disabilities. Nevertheless, some of the interventions under this action document will target all citizens and thus will have consequences that impact positively on the conditions of persons with disabilities and/or will have to reflect on how to better ensure access on equal basis to them e.g., the IPC analysis looks at all types of vulnerabilities and assesses the extent to which the most vulnerable people are able to cover their most basic needs.

### **Democracy**

Improved governance of food systems is one of the specific objectives of this Action. The various initiatives under this SO will contribute to better governance through the provision of knowledge and expertise to guide evidence-based policy making and enhanced policy dialogues with partner governments e.g. the GNAFC/IPC is a consensual analysis process which brings together actors from different backgrounds: state actors, academics, international institutions, and civil society, etc. The diversity of actors and the process of following a strict methodology that ensures that the needs of all population groups are represented makes it a highly democratic process. In the case of New Aquatic Value Chains (NAVAC), advocacy will be carried out during the different stages of project implementation; during research, to provide credibility to the value chains to be developed; through public awareness campaigns that will target the main stakeholders to build alliances and capacity, and through advocacy to ensure that laws/policies are changed/amended to suit the objective of the intervention. Furthermore, this intervention will facilitate capacity building for stakeholder engagement and strengthening of organisations/cooperatives. These advocacy efforts will increase the participation of legitimate groups (value chain stakeholders) in public discussion and deliberation, thereby strengthening democracy by way of voicing the needs of vulnerable groups and communities.

### **Conflict sensitivity, peace and resilience**

Due consideration of conflict sensitivity, peace and resilience is by its nature context specific and will have to be mainstreamed on a case-by-case basis. In general terms however, the Action acknowledges that increased pressure on resources and their unsustainable and exclusionary management opens the way to conflict and instability, which reinforce each other in a vicious circle. Consequently, there is an increased need for cooperation between stakeholders at all levels, from local to transboundary and global. Increased cooperation is dependent on, and can only be sustained through inclusive, participatory and transparent governance frameworks that address, and ultimately prevent, conflicts. This also applies to food systems and their relationship to traditional livelihoods and indigenous food systems, as well as claims for food sovereignty. Moreover, conflicts often hamper the production and distribution of food, and crises are worsened by climate change impacts and extreme weather events. Enhancing such frameworks and the variety of instruments that constitute them, as well as providing appropriate tools for prevention and peaceful conflict resolution, are key to achieving these goals. The majority of the acutely food insecure live in conflict zones. As there is an obvious link between conflicts and food crisis, this dimension is fully integrated into the IPC analysis. This is also reflected in the annual Global Report on Food Crisis which assesses the extent to which conflict is a key driver of food crises at global/regional/country level. At a minimum, from a conflict sensitivity perspective, do no harm risks will be taken into account, and conflict sensitivity requirements and analyses promoted with implementing partners and in synergy with other cross-cutting issues, including with regard to inclusion, consultation and consent of communities targeted by the Action.

### Disaster Risk Reduction

The attention to agroecological approaches and plant health to support food systems transformation is a contribution to more resilient agriculture and food systems, better equipped to face risks e.g., from climate change, as highlighted in the 2022 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) report, and to limit disruptions to the trading of international agricultural products and inputs e.g.,. In addition, the core work of the GNAFC and IPC is about factoring in risks; anticipating and mitigating them. IPC is a critical tool that builds on and contributes to Early Warning Systems.

### Other considerations if relevant

Given the multi-dimensional nature of SAAFS, they hold the potential to be key drivers for several cross-cutting issues such as women's empowerment, and economic opportunities for young people. They are also essential to achieve the objectives of the three Rio Conventions<sup>13</sup> on climate change, biodiversity and desertification/land degradation. Shaping the direction of change of agri/aquatic food systems is crucial to ensuring they contribute to sustainability, in terms of providing decent livelihoods, reducing child labour, enhancing resilience to economic shocks and climate change impacts, preserving land and biodiversity, including agrobiodiversity, and promoting low-carbon, circular economies, in line with the green transition. Digitalisation is also addressed by some of the proposed interventions such as GFAR, which aims to continue to explore the potential of digitalisation in all its activities and Collective Actions (CAs), and to promote inclusive digital agriculture in its work. In particular, it has developed a dedicated CA with the aim of enabling small-scale producers as key actors and co-innovators in the design, governance and benefit-sharing of digital agriculture technologies.

## 3.4 Risks and Lessons Learnt

Category	Risks	Likelihood (High/ Medium/ Low)	Impact (High/ Medium/ Low)	Mitigating measures
Political	Lack of partner governments' willingness to advance a multidimensional sustainability agenda	Medium	High	Focus on countries demonstrating clear commitment to SAAFS e.g., in the case of plant health highest priority will be given to countries that demonstrate a need and willingness to establish surveillance systems and sanitary and phytosanitary (SPS) measures for specified pests or overcome inefficiencies in existing systems by strengthening capacity for

<sup>13</sup> Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) and United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).



				prompt detection of, and response to, new pest introductions.
Political	Lack of partner governments' commitment to agrobiodiversity	<b>Medium</b>	<b>High</b>	The proposed intervention intends to focus on multiple countries, each of which will be selected on the basis that they have indicated support for agrobiodiversity in their respective UN Food Systems Summit national pathways discussions, have a focus on agri-food systems in their Multiannual Indicative Programme (MIP).
Political	Lack of commitment to updating and implementing national policies.	<b>Medium</b>	<b>Medium</b>	This risk will be mitigated through early engagement with relevant stakeholders and appropriate support on the planning of such activities.
Political	Land governance perceived as too sensitive to address	<b>Medium</b>	<b>Medium</b>	Use the existing robust data sources and positive experiences to raise awareness on the multiple benefits of equitable land tenure
Political	National policy makers' resistance to the implementation of policy and regulatory reforms and possible hurdles linked to economic and political interests	<b>Medium</b>	<b>High</b>	Policy dialogue will be carried out with national stakeholders, including regulatory bodies, providing training to producers and processors, and on enforcing quality and safety standards through inspections and certifications.
Political	Non-endorsement by, and limited /untimely support from, stakeholders, including national counterparts	<b>Medium</b>	<b>High</b>	Selection of the VCs to be developed and countries for pilot testing based on countries' commitments and country led actions to end malnutrition. Multi stakeholder partnerships will be set up to support the aquatic food VC development with strong involvement by stakeholders in the value chain analyses and implementations of activities.
Political	Insufficient institutional leverage for food system transformation at country level, as well as for prevention and responses on food crises / food insecurity	<b>High</b>	<b>High</b>	Provide adequate information and analyses for decision making; support institutional strengthening.
Political	Low involvement of countries and stakeholders in N4G summit.	<b>Low</b>	<b>Medium</b>	Information dissemination and communication before the event and regular exchanges with the stakeholders involved.
Political	Lack of willingness of the national authorities to publish/ use data on	<b>Low</b>	<b>High</b>	Close work with national authorities on the importance of transparency of information and on ownership of data.

	malnutrition in the context of key political deadlines.			
Economic	Economic incentives (e.g., to protect trade by not disclosing pests) may interfere with the ability to effectively monitor and respond to pest/disease threats	<b>Medium</b>	<b>Medium</b>	As neutral intergovernmental intermediaries, the implementing partner (CABI) will work with governments (in particular its member countries) to help to fulfil IPPC and OIE obligations.
Economic	Market incentives may not be strong enough for producers to use low-risk plant protection products, and markets might not have high demand for safer farm produce	<b>Medium</b>	<b>Medium</b>	Targeting of groups for whom incentives exist (e.g., commercial producers targeting markets for safe and sustainably produced food) and engaging with partners to identify added value.
Operational	Pest control practices can decrease environmental heterogeneity, increase fertilizer and pesticide input, and decrease genetic diversity	<b>Medium</b>	<b>Medium</b>	Natural protection practices and Integrated Soil Fertility management are encouraged through environmental management of crop fields.
Operational	Vulnerable stakeholders face difficulties making their needs known and defending their rights and are marginalised	<b>Medium</b>	<b>High</b>	Value chain analyses (including on social sustainability) will be an integral part of implementation and should identify this eventual risk and the specific mitigation measures at an early stage.
Operational	Insufficient cooperation among UN agencies in a One-UN framework to foster food systems transformation	<b>High</b>	<b>High</b>	Use where possible joint UN Agencies programmes and mechanisms; enhance high level political dialogue with relevant UN agencies
Operational	Low involvement of national authorities in the organisation and the follow-up of national nutrition platforms/ arguments about the leadership of national nutrition platforms.	<b>Medium</b>	<b>High</b>	Careful preparatory work for the setting up of nutrition platforms in the partner countries. Regular exchanges with national authorities in charge of nutrition to clarify the political and operational responsibilities of nutrition activities in the country.
Operational	Climate change and environmental	<b>Medium</b>	<b>medium</b>	Climate change and environmental risks integrated as early as the design phase and

	degradation impact implementation			carefully assessed during formulation and implementation phases
<p><b>Lessons Learnt:</b></p> <p>In the case of agrobiodiversity, a key lesson learned from previous AgriFood applications has been the need to provide tangible benefits to those promoting agrobiodiversity and providing public goods, e.g., via Payment for Ecosystem Services schemes, or certification and ecolabelling. Mechanisms to provide these tangible benefits have been included in the policy scenarios proposed under this Action.</p> <p>In the case of plant health, the implementation and evaluation of ‘Plantwise, Action on Invasives’ and other key projects has yielded the following key lessons which have informed the proposed intervention:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ There is still limited forward planning and prioritisation in relation to pest risks so there is a need to move from reacting to emergencies, to preparedness and coordinated response using locally appropriate and actionable information.</li> <li>✓ Digital innovations bring efficiency in plant health management and have strong potential for broad application, including the processing of large amounts of information in identifying and prioritising pest risks.</li> <li>✓ Due to the limited resources and reach of public advisory services, agro-input dealers continue to be a major source of advice to farmers; however, they often lack the capacity to provide accurate diagnoses and sound crop health advice.</li> <li>✓ While CABI programmes have reduced reliance on highly toxic pesticides, the awareness of pesticide risks and mitigation measures remains low amongst many smallholder farmers, public and private advisory service providers and consumers.</li> <li>✓ A major barrier to the use of low-risk plant protection products by farmers is their limited availability, accessibility and affordability.</li> <li>✓ The ‘any crop, any problem’ approach of Plantwise is important, however a focus on specific crops could achieve greater and more measurable impact, such as increased access to local and regional markets and greater involvement of women and youth in agri-business.</li> <li>✓ The interventions under Plantwise were not explicitly designed to address the gender gap in agriculture; the efforts made were ad-hoc and not gender transformative.</li> <li>✓ The impacts of climate change have not been consistently considered in Plantwise activities, meaning some advice has been less effective, and other critical crop health issues caused by climate change have not been addressed in plant clinics and communications campaigns.</li> </ul> <p>The main lessons learnt for <b>New Aquatic food Value Chains (NAVAC)</b> component are drawn from the ongoing FISH4ACP programme. FISH4ACP is a five-year programme, implemented by FAO that started in March 2020. It aims at developing/upgrading 12 VCs in 12 ACP countries. The programme is focused on enhancing the sustainability of those 12 VCs, through increased productivity, competitiveness and market access while ensuring that economic improvements go hand in hand with environmental sustainability and social inclusiveness. According to the lessons learnt from FISH4ACP, the main keys to success when developing VCs in small-scale fisheries and aquaculture which have informed the proposed intervention are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ The importance of partnerships: FISH4ACP demonstrated that partnerships between institutional stakeholders, small-scale actors, the private sector, and CSOs are critical for the sustainable development of aquatic food VCs. By working together, stakeholders can leverage resources and expertise, share knowledge and technology, and promote sustainable and equitable development.</li> <li>✓ The need for sustainable practices: FISH4ACP emphasized the importance of sustainable fishing and aquaculture practices for long-term economic, environmental, and social benefits. This includes promoting responsible fishing practices, investing in sustainable aquaculture production methods, and implementing regulatory frameworks to ensure sustainable use of resources.</li> <li>✓ The value of a market-oriented approach to support the development of VCs. This includes investing in value-added activities such as processing, branding, and marketing to increase competitiveness in domestic and international markets.</li> <li>✓ The role of gender equality and social inclusion are crucial for the sustainable and equitable development of the VCs. This includes promoting women's participation in the VC, ensuring equitable access to resources and benefits, and addressing social inequalities and vulnerabilities.</li> </ul>				

- ✓ The need for institutional capacity building to support the sustainable development of VCs. This includes investing in policy development, regulatory frameworks, training and education programs to build the capacity of governments, the private sector, and civil society organisations.
- ✓ The importance of the value chain selection process. Selecting the right value chains in line with the project objective is key. Lessons can be transferred from the FISH4ACP project that has carried out an extensive VC selection process.
- ✓ Furthermore, the EU funded project Value Chain Analysis for Development (VCA4D) that performs value chain analyses, provides very useful information to identify priority actions in view of improving economic performance, inclusiveness and environmental sustainability of the fisheries and aquaculture sector. Providing sound analyses may contribute also to change potential investors' perception of risks.

In addition, the results of the TRUEFISH programme can be important for the preparation of guidelines and policies when developing sustainable aquaculture value chains.

In the case of **food system governance**, the following conditions have been identified as necessary for successful food systems transformation: (i) a widely-shared long-term vision for the direction and principles of change; (ii) science and knowledge-based policy making with sufficiently robust underpinnings; (iii) multistakeholder engagement and coordination, along with a willingness to cooperate, including between the public and the private sector; (iv) institutionalised mechanisms for intersectoral and inter-ministerial coordination, steered at a high level; (v) adequate financing and appropriate incentives. In the case of nutrition governance, the organisation of the N4G summit will benefit from the experience accumulated from previous N4G summits. The last one which was organised in Tokyo (Japan) in 2021, was considered a success because of the rigorous organisation and the level of commitments made. In the case of nutrition data, the NIPN programme has been implemented since 2015 and has learnt from its successes and failures. The programme is now in its second phase and regular evaluations allow activities to be adjusted according to the various situations encountered in the countries covered. For its part, NIS is a more recent programme (2020), but the evaluation scheduled for the end of the programme will constitute an important element when a new phase aiming to merge NIPN and NIS will take into account achievements of both programmes.

### 3.5 The Intervention Logic

The underlying intervention logic for this Action is based on two fundamental principles. Firstly, the subsidiarity principle underpins all the envisaged initiatives insofar as they all require intervention on the global level which will complement and strengthen the country and regional dimensions of EU action in support of SAAFS. Secondly, the theory of change underpinning this Action is based on the premise that investing in the sustainable transformation of aquatic and agri-food systems requires a holistic approach that impacts the food system from production through to processing and consumption. This holistic approach is captured by the interrelated initiatives under the four main Components described above.

In the case of the **agrobiodiversity and land governance component**, the expected change process will come about through the interaction of the four interrelated interventions planned in this area: in the case of the Global Forum on Agricultural Research and Innovation the hypothesis is that by ensuring that small-scale producers (SSPs) are treated as key actors and co-innovators who participate meaningfully in the priority setting and governance of research and innovation (R&I) programmes and projects, that the resulting innovations will be more relevant and benefit from greater buy in from them as end users. Likewise, by putting in place more effective mechanisms to enhance the sharing of PGRFA materials, data and knowledge and promoting local value chains that produce adapted PGRFA, the ITPGRFA intervention is expected to improve smallholder farmers capacity to better manage agroecological farms that safeguard share and sustainably use plant biodiversity. These two interventions will be complemented by an intervention that will increase the application of the 'Economic valuation to promote agrobiodiversity mainstreaming in food systems' intends to increase the adoption of practices that promote agrobiodiversity by making the economic case for mainstreaming policy scenarios that enhance agrobiodiversity. On land governance, it is assumed that the empowerment and capacity-building of smallholder farmers and their organisations will allow them to better influence policy processes at global, regional and national levels, and to apply sustainable practices at farm, community and landscape levels. The theory of change underpinning the new **aquatic food value chains**, is that through the development of new sustainable aquatic food products with a high nutritional value, low cost, tasty and safe, fish consumption by vulnerable populations will increase and thus improving food security, nutrition and health, with a lower impact on environment and lower climate change emissions. Furthermore, by promoting alternative livelihoods such as algae culture and aquaculture of marine invertebrates and the diversification of sustainable aquatic food production through the valorisation of fish by-products and underutilised dryland fisheries, particularly in areas where traditional fishing practices are no longer sustainable or reliable, the supply of, and access to affordable, safe, nutritious, sustainable aquatic food products, by nutritionally vulnerable populations will be increased. In the case of **plant health**, the theory is that by increasing awareness around the hazards associated with pesticides while at the same time increasing the availability of viable alternatives, the uptake of low-risk plant protection products and sound agricultural practices by farmers will be encouraged. This process will be supported by more appropriate regulatory policies related to product registration and distribution. On the demand side, increased consumer awareness or demand for food produced without risk of contamination from pesticides is expected to encourage farmers to use low risk pest control products, thus providing incentives for agro-input dealers to invest in these products. In the case of food system governance, the availability of sound, relevant data such as that to be delivered under the **AMIS, NIPN, JRC and GNAFC-IPC** interventions will lead to evidence-based policies and better-informed / coordinated responses. This will be complemented by improved stakeholder coordination and increased financial alignment through the **FSS follow-up** intervention and the **GDPRD**. Basic assumptions that need to hold for these change processes to deliver as planned include a genuine commitment to shift to a food systems approach that moves beyond the linear linking of the individual stages of the food value chain, from production to processing, through to distribution, and consumption. Partner country commitment e.g., to adapting policies/ regulatory frameworks and to drawing on related evidence is crucial as is the engagement of all key stakeholders in the change process and their commitment to coordinate actions in line with comparative advantages and according to the principle of subsidiarity and the availability of sufficient resources. Buy in from other key stakeholders such as farmers, consumers and investors is also a key assumption that needs to hold for this Action to deliver as planned. The willingness of smallholders (including women) to adopt new practises and to engage in agroecological farming as well as demonstrating a sufficient level of openness to engage in the production and consumptions of new aquatic-based foods and apply climate smart and biodiversity-friendly plant health practises will also be key. The effectiveness of low-risk plant protection products and the viability of PGRFA products are also core assumptions as is the sufficient quality and viability of national food system pathways and the quality and timely availability of nutrition data. Positive consumer reaction to new aquatic products and positive market reaction to low-risk plant protection products are also assumed. And finally, a key assumption necessary for success will be the capacity of partner organisations to deliver quality products in a timely manner.

### 3.6 Logical Framework Matrix

At action level, the indicative logframe should have a maximum of 10 expected results (Impact/Outcome(s)/Output(s)).

It constitutes the basis for the monitoring, reporting and evaluation of the intervention.

On the basis of this logframe matrix, a more detailed logframe (or several) may be developed at contracting stage. **In case baselines and targets are not available for the action, they should be informed for each indicator at signature of the contract(s) linked to this AD, or in the first progress report at the latest.** New columns may be added to set intermediary targets (milestones) for the Output and Outcome indicators whenever it is relevant.

- At inception, the first progress report should include the complete logframe (e.g. including baselines/targets).
- Progress reports should provide an updated logframe with current values for each indicator.
- The final report should enclose the logframe with baseline and final values for each indicator.

The indicative logical framework matrix may evolve during the lifetime of the action depending on the different implementation modalities of this action.

The activities, the expected outputs and related indicators, targets and baselines included in the logframe matrix may be updated during the implementation of the action, no amendment being required to the Financing Decision.



PROJECT MODALITY (3 levels of results / indicators / Source of Data / Assumptions - no activities)

Results	Results chain (a): Main expected results (maximum 10) <sup>14</sup>	Indicators (a): (at least one indicator per expected result) <sup>15</sup>	Baselines <sup>16</sup> (values and years)	Targets (values and years)	Sources of data	Assumptions
<b>Impact</b>	To contribute to the transition to inclusive, climate-neutral, resilient, and sustainable agri-aquatic food systems.	1. GERF 2.1 Number of smallholders reached with EU supported interventions aimed to increase their sustainable production, access to markets and/or security of land 2. GERF 2.13 Number of (a) jobs, (b) green jobs supported/sustained by the EU 3. Prevalence of moderate or severe food insecurity in the population, based on the Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES), disaggregated by location, household income, composition (including, for example, presence and number of small children, members with disabilities, elderly members), sex, age and education of the household head	TBD latest by end 2024	TBD latest by end 2024	TBD latest by end 2024	<i>Not applicable</i>
<b>Outcome 1</b>	Enhanced agrobiodiversity and equitable land governance	1.1 GERF 2.1 Areas of agricultural and pastoral ecosystems where sustainable management practices have been introduced with EU support (ha) 1.2 Number of women with increased training, financial resources, technology or other resources for sustainable and safe food production, sustainable energy, sustainable transport, and clean water sources, for family consumption or for productive uses (GAP III indicator)	TBD latest by end 2024	TBD latest by end 2024	TBD latest by end 2024	Willingness of smallholders (including women) to adopt new practises  Partner governments' commitment to agro-biodiversity

<sup>14</sup> As this Action Document includes 4 Components and 12 interventions it is not possible to remain within the limit of 10 results. However, with a view to being as concise as possible, only some of the key outputs are included here. For more details on outputs see section 3.1

<sup>15</sup> All indicators to be sex disaggregated

<sup>16</sup> Baselines, targets and SoV will need to be established by each of the Implementing Partners (IPs) during the inception periods

Outcome 2	Increased availability and accessibility of nutritious and safe aquatic foods for vulnerable populations	<p>2.1 GERF 2.33 Number of women of reproductive age, adolescent girls and children under 5 reached by nutrition related interventions supported by the EU</p> <p>2.2 Number of new safe, nutrition-dense, low-cost, food products made from aquatic food and/or their by-products specifically tailored to address malnutrition among children, PLW and vulnerable populations in countries in fragile contexts introduced to markets</p> <p>2.3 GERF 2.1 Number of smallholders reached with EU supported interventions aimed to increase their sustainable production, access to markets and/or security of land</p> <p>2.4 Number of new sustainable local aquatic food products for vulnerable populations that are accessible, nutritious and safe entering the market</p>	TBD latest by end 2024	TBD latest by end 2024	TBD latest by end 2024	Sufficient level of openness to engage in the production and consumptions of new aquatic-based foods
Outcome 3	Improved food safety	<p>3.1 Number of farmers applying climate-smart plant health practices</p> <p>3.2 Volume of local production of low-risk plant protection products</p> <p>3.3. Volume of crops lost due to pest outbreaks</p>	TBD latest by end 2024	TBD latest by end 2024	TBD latest by end 2024	Farmers' openness to apply climate smart and biodiversity-friendly plant health practises Effectiveness of low-risk plant protection products

<b>Outcome 4</b>	Improved evidence-based food systems governance	<p>4.1 Number of partner countries implementing national food systems transformation pathways</p> <p>4.2 Number of partner countries drawing on information provided through NIS and NIPNs</p> <p>4.3 % of commitments made by nutrition stakeholders' during the N4G summit that have been encoded into a global nutrition accountability mechanism.</p> <p>4.4. GRFC produced annually according to quality standards, improving geo coverage and focus on root causes and long-term solutions to sustainably tackle hunger.</p>	TBD latest by end 2024	TBD latest by end 2024	TBD latest by end 2024	<p>Sufficient quality and viability of national food system pathways</p> <p>Quality and timely availability of nutrition data</p> <p>Willingness of donors to honour their commitments</p>
<b>Output 1 related to Outcome 1</b>	<p>1.1 Enhanced local value chains improve the production and consumption of adapted PGRFA</p> <p>1.2 Mechanisms strengthened to enhance the sharing of PGRFA materials, data and knowledge</p> <p>1.3 Increased capacities of smallholder farmers to manage agroecological farms with equitable land tenure and agrobiodiversity</p>	<p>1.1.1 Number of local value chains producing adapted PGRFA</p> <p>1.2.1 Number of mechanisms strengthened to enhance the sharing of PGRFA materials, data and knowledge</p> <p>1.3.1 Number of smallholder farmers with increased capacities to manage agroecological farms with equitable land tenure and agrobiodiversity</p>	TBD latest by end 2024	TBD latest by end 2024	TBD latest by end 2024	<p>Viability of PGRFA products</p> <p>Willingness of smallholders to engage in agroecological farming</p>
<b>Outputs related to Outcome 2</b>	<p>2.1 The supply and demand of new aquatic food and by-products strategies and pilot tests implemented in at least 3 countries.</p> <p>2.2 Regulatory frameworks adapted</p> <p>2.3 Business development supported</p> <p>2.4 Newly developed aquatic food products promoted</p> <p>2.5 New aquatic food products are integrated into school feeding programmes and/or other institutional meal programmes,</p>	<p>2.1.1 Number of countries where the supply and demand of new aquatic food and by-products strategies and pilot tests have been implemented</p> <p>2.2.1 Number of countries where regulatory frameworks have been adapted</p> <p>2.3.1 Number of new businesses supported</p> <p>2.4.1 Number of newly developed aquatic food products promoted</p> <p>2.5.1 Number of schools/institutions that have integrated aquatic food products into their feeding programmes</p>	TBD latest by end 2024	TBD latest by end 2024	TBD latest by end 2024	<p>Willingness of partner countries to adapt their regulatory frameworks</p> <p>Sufficient supply of aquatic food products</p> <p>Positive consumer reaction to new aquatic products</p>

<b>Outputs related to Outcome 3</b>	<p>3.1 Strengthened systems for the detection and response to pest outbreaks</p> <p>3.2 Increased capacities and systems for the local production and distribution of low-risk plant protection products</p> <p>3.3 Improved provision of gender sensitive agricultural extension services</p>	<p>3.1.1 Number of countries with strengthened systems for the detection and response to pest outbreaks</p> <p>3.2.1 Number of persons with increased capacities for local production of low-risk plant protection products</p> <p>3.2.2 Number of countries with systems in place for the distribution of low-risk plant protection products</p> <p>3.3.1 Number of agricultural extension services that have become more gender sensitive</p>	TBD latest by end 2024	TBD latest by end 2024	TBD latest by end 2024	Positive market reaction to low-risk plant protection products Effectiveness of low-risk plant protection products
<b>Outputs related to Outcome 4</b>	<p>4.1 AMIS deliverables (Market Monitor, Indicator Portal, Market Database and Policy Database) regularly updated</p> <p>4.2 Food Systems Solutions Library developed</p> <p>4.3 Country Support Portfolios co-designed, linking public and private funding and shifting the financing landscape</p> <p>4.4 Food Systems Science Policy briefs developed</p> <p>4.5 GNAFC analytical products are regularly prepared and disseminated</p> <p>4.6 Improved collection of food security data at local and national level for consistent use in the establishment of national/ regional / global strategies to fight hunger.</p> <p>4.7 Food security monitoring systems (including through IPC) are implemented to provide timely information and predictive analytical approaches for decision making at national, regional and global levels (fulfilment of data gap)</p> <p>4.8. Improved data collection, analyses and modelling for evidence-based policies</p>	<p>4.1.1 Number and frequency of AMIS deliverables</p> <p>4.2.1 Food Systems Solutions Library developed (Y/N)</p> <p>4.3.1 Number of Country Support Portfolios co-designed</p> <p>4.4.1 Number of Food Systems Science Policy briefs developed</p> <p>4.5.1 Number of GNAFC analytical products that are regularly prepared and disseminated</p> <p>4.6.1 Number of countries with improved collection of food security data at local and national level for consistent use in the establishment of national/ regional / global strategies to fight hunger.</p> <p>4.7.1 Number of food security monitoring systems (including through IPC) implemented to provide timely information and predictive analytical approaches for decision making at national, regional and global levels</p> <p>4.8.1. Number of reports using economic modelling, earth observation and geospatial data, and innovative methods (e.g. artificial intelligence, machine learning)</p>	TBD latest by end 2024	TBD latest by end 2024	TBD latest by end 2024	Capacity of partner organisations to deliver quality products in a timely manner Willingness of partner countries to improve the collection and use of food security and nutrition data

	<p>4.9 Provision of a JRC Knowledge Centre for Global Food and Nutrition Security with a repository specialised on gender equality and women's and girls' empowerment in the context of food systems and food security.</p> <p>4.10 Recommendations Database for Food Systems and Knowledge Hubs for Thematic Areas</p>	<p>4.9.1 Number of JRC Knowledge Centre for Global Food and Nutrition Security briefs</p> <p>4.10.1 Recommendations Database for Food Systems and Knowledge Hubs for Thematic Areas established (Y/N)</p>				
--	---	---	--	--	--	--

## 4. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

### 4.1 Financing Agreement

In order to implement this action, it is not envisaged to conclude a financing agreement with the partner countries.

### 4.2 Indicative Implementation Period

The indicative operational implementation period of this action, during which the activities described in section 3 will be carried out and the corresponding contracts and agreements implemented, is 72 months from the date of the adoption by the Commission of this Financing Decision.

Extensions of the implementation period may be agreed by the Commission's responsible authorising officer by amending this Financing Decision and the relevant contracts and agreements.

### 4.3 Implementation Modalities

The Commission will ensure that the EU appropriate rules and procedures for providing financing to third parties are respected, including review procedures, where appropriate, and compliance of the action with EU restrictive measures<sup>17</sup>.

#### 4.3.1 Indirect Management with an entrusted entity

##### **Component 1 Agrobiodiversity and Land Governance**

A part of this action, covering land governance, may be implemented by indirect management with an entity, which will be selected by the Commission's services using the following criteria: i) international organisation ii) presence in the different regions covered; iii) is in a neutral position re food system strategies, including on land governance; iv) experience in the different areas of work covered in this component (land governance, sustainable food systems, capacity-building, support to international networks of farmer organisations). The implementation by this entity entails Specific Objective SO1: Improved sustainability of food systems through enhanced agrobiodiversity and equitable land governance.

In case the envisaged entities need to be replaced, the Commission's services may select a replacement entity using the same criteria. If the entity is replaced, the decision to replace it needs to be justified.

A part of this action, covering the support to GFAR activities, will be implemented by indirect management with an entity, which will be selected by the Commission using the following criteria: (i) specific and successful experience in managing and/or implementing agricultural research actions; (ii) experienced in providing technical and financial support to similar thematic initiative or network ; (iii) experienced with EU funding in agricultural research for development and/or agricultural support programmes.

The support to the implementation of The International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRFA), and related actions in biodiversity mainstreaming in agriculture also involving civil society actors selected along rules of ITPGRFA and FAO, will be implemented by indirect management with FAO. The envisaged entity has been selected using the following criteria: (i) specialised UN agencies on Food and Agriculture with responsibilities on biodiversity in agriculture; (ii) host of the Secretariat of the ITPGRFA which is also an article XIV body established by a treaty under the framework of FAO .

The action on the Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity, with a specific focus on agrobiodiversity (TEEB Agrifood+) will be implemented by United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and partners (including research) under the same contribution agreement. The envisaged entity has been selected using the following criteria: (i) specialised expertise and established capacities in policy engagement on the subject (ii) previous EU funded experiences in the area of economics of ecosystems and biodiversity (such as TEEB, and TEEB Agrifood programmes).

<sup>17</sup> [www.sanctionsmap.eu](http://www.sanctionsmap.eu). Please note that the sanctions map is an IT tool for identifying the sanctions regimes. The source of the sanctions stems from legal acts published in the Official Journal (OJ). In case of discrepancy between the published legal acts and the updates on the website it is the OJ version that prevails.



In case the envisaged entity need to be replaced, the Commission's services may select a replacement entity using the same criteria. If the entity is replaced, the decision to replace it needs to be justified.

### **Component 2: Aquatic Value Chains**

A part of this action may be implemented in indirect management with the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO), which has been selected by the Commission's services using the following criteria: i) its presence in more than 130 countries, which means that it has the ability to work with local partners and stakeholders to design and implement projects that are tailored to the local context; ii) its extensive experience in working on fisheries and aquaculture development projects, including the development of aquatic food value chains; iii) it has established partnerships with a wide range of stakeholders, including governments, private sector, civil society organisations, and academia. These partnerships can be leveraged to access resources and expertise, promote knowledge sharing, and ensure buy-in and support for the project from a range of stakeholders, iv) the intervention builds upon the lessons learnt and experience gained in the implementation of the FISH4ACP programme (see section 3.4). As the implementation of this intervention requires a combination of wide expertise, that includes, apart from FAO's experience in the development of aquatic food VCs: i) designing and developing new food products to meet the nutritional requirements of the most vulnerable populations; ii) product prototyping, testing, validation launch and marketing; and iii) delivery of emergency food assistance, FAO will have to partner with a number of organisations, including research and private companies, who can provide the necessary expertise for the successful implementation of the intervention.

### **Component 3: Plant health**

A part of this action may be implemented in indirect management with CABI as an international organisation. This implementation entails activities covered under SO3 of this Action. The envisaged entity has been selected using the following criteria: similar experience in operationally and financially managing a multi-donor initiative called 'Plantwise' and the proof of concept of the envisaged intervention 'Plantwise+', high technical and scientific capacities, strong partnerships on the field and with partner countries.

### **Component 4: Food Systems Governance**

In the case of **AMIS**, funds will be subdelegated to DG AGRI which will conclude a contract with FAO, which has been selected by the Commission's services using the following criteria: i) expertise in global data collection and analysis on agriculture; and ii) ability and mandate to solicit agricultural data from countries. FAO also hosts the AMIS Secretariat.

Support to the work of the **UN Food Systems** Coordination Hub in the period 2023-2025 will be implemented in indirect management through a contribution agreement with FAO, which has been selected by the Commission's services using the following criteria: i) expertise on food systems, both comprehensively and on key (sub)sectors and themes; and ii) ability and mandate to engage with countries and other stakeholders on food systems transformation. FAO also hosts the UN Food Systems Coordination Hub.

A part of this action in support of **nutrition governance** may be implemented in indirect management with an entity (or entities), such as EU Member States agency(ies) (e.g. GIZ), and/or United Nations agency(ies) (e.g. UNICEF, or WHO) and/or International Organisation(s) (e.g. CATIE), which will be selected by the Commission's services using the following criteria a) operational capacity to build and further expand on the existing advisory supports in nutrition, b) potential to convene other EU Member States to engage in delivery on nutrition outcomes, c) capacity and experience in organising peer-learning, exchange of experiences and transfer of know how among public bodies, d) value added in the key areas of programme intervention: agri-food systems transformation for healthy and sustainable diets, multi-sectoral nutrition governance and investments, nutrition data and information analysis, innovative financing, public-private partnerships, gender transformative approaches e) absence of conflict of interest. This is in line with the recommendations of the Commission's Joint Programming Guidance. The objective of this implementation modality is to ensure more coherent, targeted intervention at global level and in partner countries. It will improve alignment with national development plans and reduce gaps and overlaps through collective intervention.

Possible implementing partners are GIZ, UNICEF, WHO, CATIE because of their global reputation for transparency and accountability and proven capacities to effectively support stakeholders to translate policy reform commitments and national programmes into practice,

In case the envisaged entity(ies) need to be replaced, the Commission's services may select a replacement entity using the same criteria. If the entity is replaced, the decision to replace it needs to be justified.

If negotiations with the envisaged entity(ies) fail, that part of this action may be implemented in direct management in direct management in accordance with the implementation modalities identified in section 4.3.3. In the case of the **GNAFC / IPC** expansion, a joint UN Agencies contribution agreement will be concluded (potentially with FAO and WFP). The entity will be selected using the following criteria: i) expertise in collection and analysis of food security data; ii) experience in developing and/or implementing food security policy, programmes and projects; and iii) active engagement in the Global Network against Food Crises.

In case the envisaged entity(ies) need to be replaced, the Commission's services may select a replacement entity using the same criteria. If the entity is replaced, the decision to replace it needs to be justified.

In the case of the **Joint Research Centre and the Knowledge Centre on Global Food and Nutrition Security**, an administrative agreement may be signed with Directorate-General JRC.

For the action related to **GDRPD**, a contribution agreement will be concluded with IFAD. IFAD is the hosting entity of the GDPRD.

#### 4.3.2 Changes from indirect to direct management mode (and vice versa) due to exceptional circumstances (one alternative second option)

If the envisaged implementation modality under indirect management above cannot be implemented due to negotiation failure or circumstances outside of the Commission's control, part of the action may be implemented in direct management through grants, according to the conditions set out in article 195 of the Financial Regulation. The selection criteria are spelled out under section 4.3.1.

The direct grant(s) without call for proposals would be justified, according to the conditions set out in article 195 f) of the Financial Regulation, because:

##### Component 1 Agrobiodiversity and Land Governance

- Land governance: the entity needs to demonstrate extensive and proven experience on land governance and its links with the issues of agroecology and agrobiodiversity. It would be selected using the following criteria: i) international organisation ii) presence in the different regions covered; iii) is in a neutral position re food system strategies, including on land governance; iv) experience in the different areas of work covered in this component (land governance, sustainable food systems, capacity-building, support to international networks of farmer organisations)
- GFAR: the entity needs to demonstrate proven experience on using the following criteria: (i) specific and successful experience in managing and/or implementing agricultural research actions; (ii) experienced in providing technical and financial support to similar thematic initiative or network; (iii) experienced with EU funding in agricultural research for development and/or agricultural support programmes and (iv) host of GFAR Secretariat
- TEEB+: the required and unique level of expertise and experience into the economics of biodiversity justify a direct grant. The entity would be selected using the following criteria: (i) specialised expertise and established capacities in policy engagement on the subject (ii) previous EU funded experiences in the area of economics of ecosystems and biodiversity (such as TEEB, and TEEB Agrifood programmes).

##### Component 2 Aquatic Value Chains

- The required and unique level of expertise and experience into the different areas of work justifies a direct grant. The alternative entity would be selected along the following criteria i) presence in as much countries as possible, and ability to work with local partners and stakeholders to design and implement projects tailored to the local context; ii) extensive experience on fisheries and aquaculture development projects, including the development of aquatic food value chains; iii) established partnerships with a wide range of stakeholders, including governments, private sector, civil society organisations, and academia, iv) the intervention builds upon the lessons learnt and experience gained in the implementation of the FISH4ACP programme (see section 3.4). As the implementation of this intervention requires a combination of wide expertise, the selected entity would in addition need to demonstrate its capacity to: i) designing and developing new food products to meet the nutritional requirements of the most vulnerable populations; ii) product prototyping, testing, validation launch and marketing; and iii) delivery of emergency food assistance.

##### Component 4: Food Systems Governance

- Nutrition governance: the complexity of the approach and the need to build a collective and coordinated action, as well as the unique level of expertise and experience, justify a direct grant. The implementing entities would be

selected on the basis of the following criteria a) operational capacity to build and further expand on the existing advisory supports in nutrition, b) potential to convene other EU Member States to engage in delivery on nutrition outcomes, c) capacity and experience in organising peer-learning, exchange of experiences and transfer of know how among public bodies, d) value added in the key areas of programme intervention: agri-food systems transformation for healthy and sustainable diets, multi-sectoral nutrition governance and investments, nutrition data and information analysis, innovative financing, public-private partnerships, gender transformative approaches e) absence of conflict of interest. This is in line with the recommendations of the Commission's Joint Programming Guidance.

- GNAFC/ITP: the coordination capacity and the neutrality required to act in conditions of acute crises justify a direct grant. The entities would be selected using the following criteria: i) expertise in collection and analysis of food security data; ii) experience in developing and/or implementing food security policy, programmes and projects; and iii) active engagement in the Global Network against Food Crises.

#### 4.4 Scope of geographical eligibility for procurement and grants

The geographical eligibility in terms of place of establishment for participating in procurement and grant award procedures and in terms of origin of supplies purchased as established in the basic act and set out in the relevant contractual documents shall apply.

The Commission's authorising officer responsible may extend the geographical eligibility on the basis of urgency or of unavailability of services in the markets of the countries or territories concerned, or in other duly substantiated cases where application of the eligibility rules would make the realisation of this action impossible or exceedingly difficult (Article 28(10) NDICI-Global Europe Regulation).

#### 4.5 Indicative Budget

The budget and scope of the action may need to be reviewed following the outcome of the mid-term review of the programming expected in the spring 2024.

<b>Indicative Budget components<sup>18</sup></b>	<b>EU contribution (amount in millions of EUR) 2023</b>	<b>EU contribution (amount in millions of EUR) 2024</b>	<b>EU contribution (amount in millions of EUR) 2025</b>
<b>Objective<sup>19</sup> 1: Agrobiodiversity and land</b>	<b>9.95</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Implementation modalities – cf. section 4.3</b>			
GFAR: indirect management with an international organisation	4		
ITPGRFA/biodiversity mainstreaming: indirect management with an international organisation	2.95		3
TEEBAgriFood+: indirect management with an international organisation		3	2
Land Governance: indirect management with an international organisation	3		3

<sup>18</sup> N.B: The final text on audit/verification depends on the outcome of ongoing discussions on pooling of funding in (one or a limited number of) Decision(s) and the subsequent financial management, i.e. for the conclusion of audit contracts and payments.

<sup>19</sup> Also referred to as Components in this document

<b>Objective 2: New Aquatic food Value Chains (NAVAC)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	
<b>Objective 3: Plant health</b>	6.99		
<b>Component 4: Food Systems Governance</b>	<b>5.45</b>	<b>10.8</b>	<b>3</b>
AMIS	1.2		3
Food Systems Hub	2	1	
Support to nutrition governance (N4G, GNR; NIPN, NIS)		3	
Global Network and IPC	2	4	
SESAFS:Administrative arrangement with DG JRC	0.25	2.8	
GDPRD			
<b>Evaluation</b> – cf. section 5.2 <b>Audit</b> – cf. section 5.3	Will be covered by another Decision		
<b>Communication and visibility</b> – cf. section 6	N/A		
<b>Totals</b>	<b>32.39</b>	<b>23.8</b>	<b>11</b>

#### 4.6 Organisational Set-up and Responsibilities

As part of its prerogative of budget implementation and to safeguard the financial interests of the Union, the Commission may participate in the above governance structures set up for governing the implementation of the action and may sign or enter into joint declarations or statements, for the purpose of enhancing the visibility of the EU and its contribution to this action and ensuring effective coordination..

**Component 1:** In the case of the land governance sub-component, the overall steering of the action will be done through a steering committee co-chaired by the EU and the international organisation selected. The committee will include representatives of the beneficiary organisations. GFAR and ITPGRFA have their established governance structures in which the EU participates. A specific Steering Committee will be established under TEEBAGRIFOOD+ with participating stakeholders will include involved EU Delegations and participating stakeholder when relevant. In the case of **Component 2**, a Steering Committee will be established that is co-chaired by the EU and FAO. Participating stakeholders will include all implementing partners and EUDs involved. Representatives from the value chains can be invited as observers, on a case-by-case basis. The role of the steering committee will be to provide overall guidance on the work plan and budget, steer and guide the technical execution of the intervention including monitoring and evaluation aspects and support the dissemination of results across their networks. The Steering Committee will meet at least twice per year. A Project Coordination Unit (PCU) will be established to undertake the day-to-day operations and administration of the intervention. The role of the PCU includes liaising between dedicated value chain project staff in the field and staff in Headquarters to ensure appropriate backstopping for the value chain (VC) interventions in the various countries, as well as monitoring progress against results. The PCU will also liaise and assist the national VC projects in the recruitment of consultants, large value contracts, procurement, delivery of meetings and workshops and other aspects as needed. In the case of **Component 3**, the overall governance will be guided by CABI's annual donor reporting and meetings and internally by a 'Programme Board' (PB) consisting of CABI personnel representing all global regions involved in the work packages. The PB sets the programme direction according to the programme-level logical framework and multi-year strategy, facilitates monitoring and evaluation against annual milestones and overall objectives, and develops proposals to secure multi-donor engagement. The PB facilitates interaction and collaboration with regional/international organisations, regional economic communities, sub-regional agricultural research organisations, regional commodity-based private sector bodies and trade organisations, and international companies. It collects and considers feedback and advice from internal teams, national and international partners as well as donors to steer the programme, such as when deciding to scale up and scale out activities. In the case of **Component 4**, the G20 **AMIS Secretariat** is formed by FAO, IFAD, IFPRI, IGC, WFP, OECD, World Bank, WTO, the UN High Level Task Force (UN-HLTF) and UNCTAD. Organisations contributing financial or staff resources to AMIS have a decision-making role with respect to its overall planning and day-to-day implementation. The Secretariat is housed in FAO headquarters in Rome and supports all functions of the

Forum and the Information Group of AMIS. The **UN Food Systems Coordination Hub** is also hosted by FAO on behalf of the UN system. It is steered by an Oversight Steering Group comprising the principals of FAO, WFP, IFAD, UN-DCO and the UN Task Force Leads, with participation from the UN DSG. In the case of N4G/NIPN-NIS, the implementing entity(ies) ensure(s) the coherence of all components of the action, allocate(s) resources according to the priorities needs identified by the Commission and coordinate(s) with the Commission on a monthly basis.

## 5. PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT

### 5.1 Monitoring and Reporting

The day-to-day technical and financial monitoring of the implementation of this action will be a continuous process, and part of the implementing partners' responsibilities. To this end, the implementing partners shall establish a permanent internal, technical and financial monitoring system for their actions and elaborate regular progress reports (not less than annual) and final reports. Every report shall provide an accurate account of implementation of the action, difficulties encountered, changes introduced, as well as the degree of achievement of results (Outputs and Outcomes) as measured by corresponding indicators, using as a reference the logframe matrix.

The Commission may undertake additional project monitoring visits both through its own staff and through independent consultants recruited directly by the Commission for independent monitoring reviews (or recruited by the responsible agent contracted by the Commission for implementing such reviews).

Roles and responsibilities for data collection, analysis, monitoring and reporting will be clearly identified by each of the implementing partners cited in this Action Document and will be communicated to the Commission during the inception phase.

Monitoring will assess gender equality results, impacts on rights of groups living in the most vulnerable situations and the implementation of the human rights-based approach working principles (applying all human rights for all; meaningful and inclusive participation and access to decision-making; non-discrimination and equality; accountability and rule of law for all; and transparency and access to information supported by disaggregated data). Monitoring (and evaluation) will be based on indicators that are disaggregated by sex, age, disability when applicable.

Human rights and gender equality competence is ensured in the monitoring (and evaluation) teams.

### 5.2 Evaluation

Having regard to the importance of the action, a mid-term and/or final evaluation(s) may be carried out for this action or its components via independent consultants and/or through joint missions contracted by the Commission or via an implementing partner.

In case a mid-term evaluation is envisaged. It will be carried out for problem solving and learning purposes, and any other issues identified in the course of implementation.

In case a final or ex-post evaluation is envisaged it will be carried out for accountability and learning purposes at various levels (including for policy revision).

The Commission shall inform the implementing partners at least one month in advance of the dates envisaged for the evaluation missions. The implementing partner shall collaborate efficiently and effectively with the evaluation experts, and inter alia provide them with all necessary information and documentation, as well as access to the project premises and activities.

The evaluation reports may be shared with the partners and other key stakeholders following the best practice of evaluation dissemination. The implementing partner and the Commission shall analyse the conclusions and recommendations of the evaluations and, where appropriate, in agreement with the partner country, jointly decide on the follow-up actions to be taken and any adjustments necessary, including, if indicated, the reorientation of the project.

The financing of the evaluation shall be covered by another measure constituting a Financing Decision.

### 5.3 Audit and Verifications

Without prejudice to the obligations applicable to contracts concluded for the implementation of this action, the Commission may, on the basis of a risk assessment, contract independent audit or verification assignments for one or several contracts or agreements.

## 6. STRATEGIC COMMUNICATION AND PUBLIC DIPLOMACY

The 2021-2027 programming cycle will adopt a new approach to pooling, programming and deploying strategic communication and public diplomacy resources.

In line with the 2022 '[Communicating and Raising EU Visibility: Guidance for External Actions](#)', it will remain a contractual obligation for all entities implementing EU-funded external actions to inform the relevant audiences of the Union's support for their work by displaying the EU emblem and a short funding statement as appropriate on all communication materials related to the actions concerned. This obligation will continue to apply equally, regardless of whether the actions concerned are implemented by the Commission, partner countries, service providers, grant beneficiaries or entrusted or delegated entities such as UN agencies, international financial institutions and agencies of EU member states.

However, action documents for specific sector programmes are in principle no longer required to include a provision for communication and visibility actions promoting the programmes concerned. These resources will instead be consolidated in Cooperation Facilities established by support measure action documents, allowing Delegations to plan and execute multiannual strategic communication and public diplomacy actions with sufficient critical mass to be effective on a national scale.

## APPENDIX 1 REPORTING IN OPSYS

An Intervention (also generally called project/programme) is the operational entity associated to a coherent set of activities and results structured in a logical framework aiming at delivering development change or progress. Interventions are the most effective (hence optimal) entities for the operational follow-up by the Commission of its external development operations. As such, Interventions constitute the base unit for managing operational implementations, assessing performance, monitoring, evaluation, internal and external communication, reporting and aggregation.

Primary Interventions are those contracts or groups of contracts bearing reportable results and respecting the following business rule: ‘a given contract can only contribute to one primary intervention and not more than one’. An individual contract that does not produce direct reportable results and cannot be logically grouped with other result reportable contracts is considered a ‘support entities’. The addition of all primary interventions and support entities is equivalent to the full development portfolio of the Institution.

Primary Interventions are identified during the design of each action by the responsible service (Delegation or Headquarters operational Unit).

The level of the Primary Intervention is defined in the related Action Document and it is revisable; it can be a(n) (group of) action(s) or a (group of) contract(s).

Tick in the left side column one of the three possible options for the level of definition of the Primary Intervention(s) identified in this action.

In the case of ‘Group of actions’ level, add references to the present action and other action concerning the same Primary Intervention.

In the case of ‘Contract level’, add the reference to the corresponding budgetary items in point 4.6, Indicative Budget.

<b>Option 3: Contract level</b>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Single Contract 1	Contract with IFAD for the Global Forum on Agricultural Research and Innovation (GFAR)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Single Contract 2	Contract with FAO for the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRF)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Single Contract 3	Contract with UNEP for the application of economic valuation to promote agro-biodiversity mainstreaming in food systems
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Single Contract 4	Contract with IFAD and/or FAO for land governance
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Single Contract 5	Contract with FAO for New Aquatic Food Value Chains (NAVAC)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Single Contract 6	Contract with CABI for Plant Health
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Single Contract 7	Contract with FAO for Agricultural Market Information System (AMIS)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Single Contract 8	Contract with for the Food System Summit (FSS) follow up
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Single Contract 9	Contract with UNICEF and/or WHO for National Information Platforms for Nutrition (NIPN) and Nutrition information Systems (NIS)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Single Contract 10	Contract with GIZ for National Information Platforms for Nutrition (NIPN) and Nutrition information Systems (NIS)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Single Contract 11	Contract with FAO and WFP for the Global Network against Food Crises (GNAFC)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Single Contract 12	Contract with IFAD for the Global Donor Platform for Rural Development (GDPRD)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Single Contract 13	Delegated agreement with the French Government for the N4G Summit

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Single Contract 14	Administrative agreement with JRC for Scientific Evidence for Sustainable Agri-Food Systems and fisheries (SESAFS):
-------------------------------------	--------------------	---