Brighter Green

TALANOA DIALOGUE SUBMISSION

2 April 2018

Climate Policy Needs to Address the Urgency of Ensuring Sustainable, Equitable, and Climate-Compatible Food and Agriculture Systems

INTRODUCTION

Brighter Green welcomes this opportunity to submit input to the Talanoa Dialogue process and to the essential tasks of taking stock of progress to date, and then increasing ambition. In this submission, we have addressed all three of the questions posted by the Dialogue: where are we?; where do we want to go?; And, how do we get there? We agree that the Paris Agreement is an important milestone on the pathway toward a stable climate. But the Paris Agreement and Conference of the Parties (COP) summits have largely ignored a crucial fact: what the world eats and how it produces its food are extremely important factors in addressing climate change, more than most governments and their citizens generally recognize. The 2018 Talanoa Dialogue provides an important opportunity for parties and stakeholders to hold an open and frank dialogue about what is needed to meet the Paris targets and increase ambition; we believe the Dialogue should address largely unacknowledged, but essential, facets of a just transition, including global and national food and agricultural systems.

KEY POINTS

- Without addressing food and agriculture emissions more forcefully, the Paris targets cannot be met
- Non-CO_2 GHGs in the agriculture and land sector, as well as other sectors, should be addressed more directly
- Including comprehensive food and agriculture policy measures in NDCs offers an opportunity to reduce GHGs and promote food security
- Multi-stakeholder collaboration is needed in both the short and long terms
- Policies to shift consumption as well as production patterns, especially in populations with historically high consumption of animal products, has many co-benefits that can help ensure the protection of public health, forests and other ecosystems, biodiversity, livelihoods, and more
- Public procurement is an excellent space to test out bold policies and practices

WHERE ARE WE?

Government parties to the Paris Agreement acknowledged that the pledges they made for reducing GHGs prior to COP 21 were inadequate (as contained in Intended

Nationally Determined Contributions, or INDCs). It's clear that future plans will have to be more ambitious, and encompass both developed and fast-growing emerging nations reducing emissions throughout their economies—not just in the energy sector. A growing body of research demonstrates that agriculture and food systems must be included in current and future climate policy, both at global and national levels.

"Food" appears three times in the Paris Agreement text. Article 2 contains an important call to safeguard "food security" and end hunger and to recognize the "particular vulnerabilities of food production systems to the adverse impacts of climate change." These are goals Brighter Green strongly supports. However, the language used does not capture the destabilizing effects climate change already is having on agriculture through more frequent droughts, erratic rainfall, higher temperatures, and desertification.

Article 2 also commits governments to "strengthen the global response to the threat of climate change" by, among other measures, "Increasing the ability to adapt to the adverse impacts of climate change and foster climate resilience and low greenhouse gas emissions development, in a manner that does not threaten food production." This text could be interpreted to mean that the "production" aspects of agriculture, i.e., increased yields and volume, should be protected from any actions that could change the status quo. A converse exists, too. It can be argued, with solid data, that the current model of intensive animal agriculture, created in industrialized regions and now becoming increasingly common globally, itself threatens food production.

WHERE DO WE NEED TO GO?

The global food system as a whole (farming, transportation, packing, etc.) contributes 20 to 30 percent of anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions.[1] According to the FAO, the global livestock sector accounts for 14.5 percent of anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions.[2] Carbon dioxide is released via soil tilling and the transport of livestock and feed grains, such as corn and soy. It is also released by treating livestock-feed grains with nitrogen-based fertilizers and petroleum-based pesticides.[3]

Methane, though lower in concentration in Earth's atmosphere than CO_2, is much more efficient in trapping heat. Methane emissions result mainly through the belching and flatulence of ruminant livestock, as well as storage of manure.[4] Nitrous oxide, another major greenhouse gas, is also released primarily through animal waste.[5] According to the World Resources Institute, global emissions from agriculture increased eight percent from 1990 to 2010, with population growth and dietary change being the greatest drivers.[6]

According to the Environmental Working Group (EWG), lamb and beef have the highest rates of greenhouse gas emissions at 39.2 kg and 27.0 kg of CO_2 equivalent per

kilogram of food consumed.[7] The third largest culprit is cheese, although its emissions per kilogram are less than half those of beef. Pork, farmed salmon, turkey, and chicken follow close behind.[8] Soybeans grown to feed livestock also contribute to climate change and mass deforestation and loss of other kinds of vegetation, including in Brazil's Cerrado, the most biologically diverse grassland in the world.[9] Every year, 6,100 square miles of the Cerrado are destroyed to make room for cattle, soy, and sugarcane used for ethanol production.[10]

Governments in Paris pledged to keep global temperature increases to less than 2°C above pre-industrial levels and to work toward the more ambitious target of limiting the overall temperature rise to 1.5°C. But simply to hold temperatures below 2°C will require not only the rapid reduction of CO_2 emissions, but also those of other GHGs, including methane, which is twenty-five times more potent a GHG than CO_2. It also has a much shorter life in the atmosphere than CO_2, suggesting that reducing methane emissions, in line with reducing CO_2, could have a considerable short- and long-term effect on atmospheric warming. Nearly half of the world's methane emissions come from the livestock sector.[11]

Brighter Green's research and that of other research organizations and a growing body of natural and social scientists, concludes that this system of food production and agricultural development also forestalls the possibility of promoting sustainable, equitable, and climate-resilient food systems. This is due to industrial animal agriculture's enormous water, land, and chemical fertilizer requirements; the monocultures it creates, of both non-human animals and feed crops; the massive water pollution, deforestation, and biodiversity losses it requires; and, of course, the GHG emissions embedded in the production system itself.

These impacts are acknowledged increasingly in industrialized countries, and Brighter Green's research documents how they are being felt in countries throughout the world now, too.[12] More than 70 billion animals are used in food production each year; this number could reach 120 billion by 2050 if the current trajectory is unchanged.

Increasingly, researchers agree that such a scenario is wholly unsustainable and incompatible with global climate goals. They also agree that it will be almost impossible to achieve the targets agreed in the Paris Accord without a shift to eating and producing, less meat and other animal-based foods.[13]

Yet, the large-scale awareness and change – from climate negotiators, policy-makers, the private sector, institutions, international agencies, and the world's citizens – is still only a small portion of what is required.

HOW DO WE GET THERE?

The FAO defines sustainable diets as "diets with low environmental impacts which contribute to food and nutrition security and to healthy life for present and future generations. Sustainable diets are protective and respectful of biodiversity and ecosystems, culturally acceptable, accessible, economically fair and affordable; nutritionally adequate, safe and healthy; while optimizing natural and human resources."

In 2014, Nature published the article, "Global diets link environmental sustainability and human health," which directly addressed the environmental costs of the industrialized food system.[14] The authors propose that vegetarian, pescetarian, and Mediterranean diets could help decrease both rates of non-communicable diseases (NCDs) as well as agriculture-related GHGs and species extinction.[15]

Researchers from Cambridge University found in a study published in 2014 that a global transition to healthier diets could cut CO_2 equivalent emissions by an extra 6 billion tonnes by 2050, nearly all from reduced meat consumption.[16] A focus on dietary change could also lower the costs of climate mitigation by up to 50 percent by 2050.[17]

In March 2016, researchers at Oxford University published an analytic report with the conclusion that reducing meat consumption and transitioning to plant-based diets would cut GHG emissions by between 29 and 70 percent by 2050 and save up to eight million lives each year by 2050. They also calculated that plant-centered diets could save between U.S.$ 700 and one trillion annually in healthcare costs globally. The researchers found the greatest reductions in GHGs and the largest numbers of deaths avoided came from adopting vegetarian and vegan diets.[18]

Nonetheless, global meat consumption could rise by 76 percent by 2050. Without government intervention, consumers are unlikely to eat less meat, and agricultural producers have little incentive to reduce supply. This leaves governments trapped in a cycle of inertia, including with regard to climate policy. Yet, research by the think tank Chatham House and University of Glasgow in Brazil, China, the U.S., and U.K suggests that publics expect governments to lead in the area of climate change and food and agricultural policy, and the risks of a backlash are overestimated.[19]

A multi-pronged approach by governments, cooperating with researchers, civil society organizations, educational institutions, and other stakeholders is most likely to succeed. Public education campaigns to raise awareness of the climate consequences of meat production and consumption could be joined to efforts to inform people about health benefits, too, drawing on efforts underway in many countries to educate publics about the risks of abusing tobacco and alcohol, or overconsuming processed and "junk" foods, and drinking sugar-laden sodas.

While essential, raising public awareness is not sufficient. National guidelines for sustainable and healthful diets are also needed to 1) lay out the links between what we eat, natural resources like water and energy, GHGs, and long-term food security; and 2) encourage and support individuals and institutions to purchase and consume more plant-based foods and less meat and other animal-based foods. Such national directives are now recognized as an important element in a comprehensive approach to ensuring healthier diets and addressing climate change.

Procurement is another key area. Governments are often the largest buyers of food products, for example for schools, state institutions like hospitals and government ministries, and militaries. Governments can and should also work with industry to agree on labels that clearly identify low-GHG, healthier, more sustainable food products; and encourage investment in the research and development of alternatives to animal-based protein, including plant-based proteins and cellular meat, and develop a regulatory environment to support such innovation.

Governments should also identify and remove or redirect subsidies and fiscal policies, or other facets of policy and political support, for practices that put at risk the goals of the Paris Accord and more ambitious targets, and that have negative effects on forests, other ecosystems, soils, water, and overall resilience to the effects of global warming. This would mean a reorientation from large-scale animal agriculture toward more sustainable, climate-compatible means of producing and consuming food. Such a transition would also provide opportunities for protecting forests, grasslands, and soils, as well as restoring landscapes to enhance nature-based systems of carbon sequestration. Such protection and restoration will also have multiple additional benefits for natural resources (e.g., water, land, air), public health, livelihoods, and biodiversity.

In many countries of the global South, awareness of the connections between NCDs, food security, and the Western diet and Western methods of food production is limited, even as global food corporations target these countries for expansion. The asymmetries in this equation need to be changed, and it is the responsibility of policymakers, researchers, public health professionals, academics, and civil society to promote and ensure this change through a variety of means and institutions. The next set of NDCs (to be submitted in 2020) offers an opportunity for countries to include measures to achieve this, through bold supply and demand side interventions.

Global development policy writ large should put a priority on promoting sustainable diets and systems of food production. Several of the United Nations' 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) would support such efforts, especially goals 2 (zero hunger), 3 (good health and wellbeing), 12 (responsible production and consumption), 13 (combat climate change and its impacts), and 15 (life on land). As the SDGs more fully inform global development priorities and funding for them, and are integrated with

global climate policy, it will be important for researchers and advocates for sustainable diets and food systems to encourage governments and international agencies to develop concrete policy measures and provide the budgets needed to implement them.

Given the potential, and the benefits, we conclude this submission by asking: why wouldn't reducing GHGs from meat (and other animal-based foods) consumption and production become a priority for governments through the Talanoa Dialogue and follow up processes? Stabilizing the global climate – and ensuring the protection of public health, forests and other ecosystems, biodiversity, livelihoods, the lives of billions of animals (both domesticated and wild) – requires no less.

Brighter Green is a New York City-based public policy action tank that works to raise awareness of and encourage policy action on issues that span the environment, animals, and sustainability. Brighter Green has been participating as an NGO observer in the UNFCCC since COP 15 in 2009. Brighter Green works in the U.S. and internationally with a focus on the countries of the global South and a strong commitment to ensuring and expanding equity and rights. On its own and in partnership with other organizations and individuals, Brighter Green generates and incubates research and project initiatives that are both visionary and practical. It produces publications, websites, documentary films, and programs to illuminate public debate among policy-makers, activists, communities, influential leaders, and the media, with the goal of social transformation at local and international levels.

http://www.brightergreen.org

ENDNOTES

1 Garnett, Tara. (April 2014). "What is a Sustainable Healthy Diet?." Food and Climate Research Network.
2 Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (2013). "Tackling Climate Change through Livestock – A Global Assessment of Emissions and Mitigation Opportunities." http://www.fao.org/3/a-i3437e.pdf.
3 MacDonald, Mia & Iyer, Sangamithra. (2011). "Skillful Means: The Challenges of China's Encounter with Factory Farming." Brighter Green.
4 Ibid.
5 Ibid.
6 Ranganathan, Janet; Vennard, Daniel; Waite, Richard; Dumas, Patrice; Lipinski, Brian; Searchinger, Tim. (April 2016). "Installment 11 of 'Creating a Sustainable Food Future': Shifting Diets for a Sustainable Food Future." World Resources Institute.
7 "Meat Eater's Guide: Report. Climate and Environmental Impacts." (2011). Environmental Working Group. http://www.ewg.org/meateatersguide/a-meat-eaters-guide-to-climate-change-health-what-you-eat-matters/climate-and-environmental-impacts/
8 Ibid.
9 MacDonald, Mia & Simon, Justine. (2011). "Cattle, Soyanization, and Climate Change: Brazil's Agricultural Revolution." Brighter Green.
10 Ibid.
11 Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (2013), ibid.
12 Brighter Green Policy Research (2011-2017). http://brightergreen.org/policy-research/.
13 Pelletier, Nathan & Tyedmers, Peter. (26 October 2010). Forecasting Potential Global Environmental Costs of Livestock Production 2000-2050. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America. http://www.pnas.org/content/107/43/18371.
14 Union of Concerned Scientists. "Industrial Agriculture: The Outdated, Unsustainable System that Dominates U.S. Food Production." http://www.ucsusa.org/our-work/food-agriculture/our-failing-food-system/industrial-agriculture#.WUvvi4WkexE.
15 Tilman, David & Clark, Michael. (November 2014). Global Diets Link Environmental Sustainability and Human Health. Nature. https://www.nature.com/articles/nature13959.
16 Bajželj, B., et al. (2014). Importance of Food-demand Management for Climate Mitigation. Nature Climate Change. https://www.nature.com/articles/nclimate2353.
17 Stehfest, E., Bouwman, L., van Vuuren, D.P., den Elzen, M.G.J., Eickhout, B., and Kabat, P. (July 2009). Climate Benefits of Changing Diet. Climatic Change. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-008-9534-6.
18 Springmann, Marco; Godfray, H. Charles J.; Rayner, Mike; Scarborough, Peter. (9 February 2016). Analysis and Valuation of the Health and Climate Change Cobenefits of Dietary Change. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America. http://www.pnas.org/content/113/15/4146.
19 Wellesley, L., Happer, C., Froggatt, A. and Philo, G. (2015). Changing Climate, Changing Diets: Pathways to Lower Meat Consumption. Chatham House, London.