



Integrating climate and nutrition

This is a summary of the following report: *GAIN (2023) Accelerating action and opening opportunities: A closer integration of climate and nutrition 2023 I-CAN baseline assessment*.

<https://www.gainhealth.org/resources/reports-and-publications/accelerating-action-and-opening-opportunities-closer-integration-climate-and-nutrition>

Ahead of the UN Climate Change Conference (COP 28) in the United Arab Emirates, this report assesses the current integration of climate and nutrition and opportunities to act more cohesively.

The Initiative on Climate Action and Nutrition (I-CAN) is a multi-stakeholder, multi-sectoral global flagship programme formally launched at COP 27. For this baseline assessment, I-CAN selected 20 indicators. Using 13 of these indicators, this analysis uses four 'levels' to assess the degree of integration between climate and nutrition, from no integration (level 1) to strong integration (level 4). This four-level approach provides a straightforward way to present over 1,500 data points across indicators, which would be too large to outline individually. Despite the wealth of data to penetrate, there are some key takeaways that can be lifted from this report.

Integration within national plans is limited

Nationally Determined Contributions¹ (NDCs) showed the lowest levels of climate-nutri-

tion integration and just 2% scored in the highest level of integration (level 4). National Adaptation Plans² (NAPs) fared slightly better (16%) and National Nutrition Plans were more closely integrated with climate (28%) – but all are clearly lacking. The report found that 60% of NDCs achieved 'level 1', which indicates that there is no intention to connect climate and nutrition. This may reflect that, under the 2015 Paris Agreement, country commitments have focused on emissions reduction and therefore more heavily on issues such as land use, pollution, and energy.

Data and knowledge transfer remain poor

In the 2022 Global Nutrition Report³, 95% of stakeholder commitments that are monitored do not consider climate or sustainability in any way. In total, 38% of data and knowledge portals had no links (level 1) between climate and nutrition. However, recent Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change reports did score 'level 4', indicating that there were many in-depth considerations of nutrition within them. This could offer a blueprint for other actors working in the capacity building, data, and knowledge transfer areas.

A paucity of policy data

Data on the number of food-based dietary guidelines that include climate considerations and the number of countries factoring climate into food procurement decisions was generally limited. The authors therefore noted that this area may fare better than the analysis implies. Yet, 54% of food-based dietary guidelines and 83% of food procurement policies scored 'level 1' – which is again disappointing.

Investment is poor

From 2021 to 2022, just 3% of Green Climate Fund grants included interventions addressing nutrition interventions (level 4). Fewer than 1% of projects (2018–2022) included both climate and nutrition themes.

Summary

Climate change and nutrition are inextricably linked, but this report shines a spotlight on the lack of progress that governments and actors are making on integration. In many cases, across multiple policy areas, there is an intention to act. However, this intention is yet to result in coherent, robust action – apart from in a few outlier countries.

¹ NDCs are non-binding national climate mitigation plans that contribute to achieving the global goals set out in the Paris Agreement. Broadly speaking, these plans aim to limit and/or reduce damage to the ecosystem.

² NAPs aim to identify medium- and long-term adaptation needs (e.g., developing flood defences in low-lying areas) for countries, with the process outlined by the 2010 'Cancun Agreements'. Broadly speaking, these plans aim to adjust settings to be more resilient to existing climate challenges.

³ <https://globalnutritionreport.org/reports/2022-global-nutrition-report/>

Global Report on Food Crises 2023

This is a summary of the following report: *Food Security Information Network (2023) 2023 Global Report on Food Crises*.

<https://www.fsinplatform.org/report/global-report-food-crises-2023/>

The 7th iteration of the annual Global Report on Food Crises (GRFC) was published in 2023 and contains a comprehensive analysis of acute food insecurity across regional, national, and sub-national levels during 2022. A full breakdown of the findings and methods employed in this technical, evidence-based, 213-page report is beyond the scope of this summary, but some of its key themes are explored below. The report draws on data from 2022 with the support of 16 GRFC partner organisations. Data was drawn predominantly from the Integrated Food Security Phase Classification¹ (IPC) or the Cadre Harmonisé² – among others.

Almost 258 million people across 58 countries were in 'crisis' or food insecurity (IPC Phase 3 or above). This is a marked increase on the previous year (193 million across 53 countries), even when accounting for global population increase during the same period.

The lingering effects of the COVID-19 pandemic were an effect multiplier for, if not a direct

cause of, many recurrent shocks. Economic shocks were the main driver of acute food insecurity in 27 countries – with the war in Ukraine being a key upstream factor. The war, arriving shortly after the macroeconomic fallout of the COVID-19 pandemic, has exerted a domino effect on other countries due to Ukraine and Russia's contribution to global fuel, fertiliser, wheat, maize, and sunflower oil production. This creates ongoing market volatility, with the hyperinflation of staple foods now present in multiple territories.

Conflict and insecurity were the direct drivers of acute food insecurity across 19 countries, with weather extremes – predicted to increase in severity and frequency in the coming years – being the primary driver in 12 countries.

Despite this global burden, the report highlights the 'hotspot' nature of such crises, with over 40% of the IPC Phase 3 or above population residing in just five countries: the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ethiopia, Afghanistan, Nigeria, and Yemen. When look-

ing at the share of food insecurity by the analysed population of each country, the findings are sobering – around half the populations of Yemen (55%), Syria (55%), Afghanistan (46%), and Pakistan (43%) were food insecure.

People in seven countries faced 'catastrophe' (IPC Phase 5): Somalia, South Sudan, Yemen, Afghanistan, Haiti, Nigeria, and Burkina Faso. More than half of these 376,400 people were in Somalia (214,100).

“Conflicts and mass displacement continue to drive global hunger. Rising poverty, deepening inequalities, rampant underdevelopment, the climate crisis, and natural disasters also contribute to food insecurity”

– António Guterres, in a foreword to the report

Despite these findings, the report also sheds light on possible solutions – particularly earlier intervention to reduce food gaps and to protect livelihoods, as prevention is more cost-effective than a later, crisis-oriented response. However, traditional funding cycles and the broader humanitarian and political economies often focus on the latter model, creating further challenges.

¹ <https://www.ipcinfo.org/>

² <https://www.ipcinfo.org/ch/>