



✗ We must choose between economic growth and environmental sustainability.

✓ There is no trade off. Transformed food and land use systems can deliver economic growth at the same time as supporting the delivery of environmental targets, including the Paris Agreement.



✗ Fertiliser and pesticide driven large scale monoculture is the only thing that can deliver calories in sufficient quantity to feed a growing population.

✓ Intelligent application of a combination of regenerative practices, precision farming and increased agrobiodiversity can yield sustainable, robust overall productivity growth.



✗ Decarbonising the energy system is sufficient to tackle climate change and should continue to be the primary and dominant focus of climate action.

✓ Without food and land use sector transformation, we can kiss both the Paris Agreement targets and the Sustainable Development Goals goodbye.  
There is no pathway to 1.5 degrees Celsius which does not require an almost immediate end to deforestation.



✗ Paying for the environment must make food more expensive for consumers

✓ Food and land use transformation will increase food security significantly by helping to stabilise or even lower real food prices at the same time as ensuring sufficient production.  
Safety nets should be used to ensure a just transition.



✗ Delivering environmental goals requires everyone to give up meat

✓ Total global consumption of land-grazing meat such as cattle and sheep should be gradually reduced. But it need not be entirely eliminated for health or environmental purposes.  
This is about convergence; wealthier regions with higher meat consumption must reduce their livestock-based protein intake by about two thirds, whereas poorer global regions must be supported to diversify and improve their protein sources.



✗ Biodiversity and climate objectives compete with each other. We cannot have both.

✓ There are huge synergies between these two objectives, especially in the context of protecting tropical rainforests, the home to over two-thirds of terrestrial biodiversity.  
Generally, the best land-based climate mitigation option is to protect and restore natural ecosystems.



✗ The ocean is a minor variable in the overall food/protein equation, not least given our track-record of over-fishing.

✓ The ocean is the most productive source of biomass and protein generation on the planet and could potentially contribute orders of magnitude more to sustainable human diets than today – we just need to manage it more effectively and regeneratively.



✗ Human and planetary health diets are standardised and will limit culinary enjoyment and cultural variations in what people eat.

✓ A "human and planetary health diet" allows for significant diversity of exciting and tasty diets.  
This is consistent with a broad spectrum of traditional regional diets such as Cantonese, Mediterranean, South Indian and indigenous Amazonian as well as flexitarian and pescatarian.



✗ As people's incomes grow their diets improve.

✓ In the absence of educational interventions and strong policy frameworks, people tend to eat less healthily as they get richer.



✗ Driving up agricultural productivity is the main route to tackling rural poverty.

✓ Developing off-farm employment, increasing rural connectedness and promoting new rural-urban linkages are at least as important as driving up agricultural productivity in tackling rural poverty.



✗ To feed more than 9 billion people a healthy diet, we need to cut down forests to make way for more agricultural land to produce sufficient affordable food.

✓ We can secure healthy and affordable diets for the projected population using 1.2 billion hectares less of agricultural land than we use today.  
This is achievable under realistic assumptions regarding dietary shift, reduction in food loss and waste and productivity gains.



✗ Facilitating trade in all its forms increases efficiency and resilience of the global food and land use systems.

✓ Trade can help countries access a greater variety of foods, and comparative advantage helps make food cheaper.  
But trade flows can also magnify environmental costs, with countries failing to price their natural capital properly, and can expand access to unhealthy, ultra-processed food.



✗ Large-scale, top-down land use zoning cannot be done effectively where there is predominantly private ownership to land.

✓ It can be done, and it has been done – e.g. in Brazil under the Forest Code.  
Restrictions on how private landowners use their land combined with incentives to use it better will be a precondition to achieving the SDGs and Paris Agreement.



✗ Externality taxes are growth inhibiting and regressive, payments for ecosystem services at scale are impossibly expensive and have little social value.

✓ Both mechanisms can be affordable, highly effective, help drive sustainable growth and - crucially - provide incentives for rural communities to drive positive environmental and health outcomes.



✗ It will cost a fortune to transform food and land use systems.

✓ The additional investment required to move to sustainable food and land use systems is between \$300 and \$350 billion per year (less than 0.5% of GDP), yielding a return on investment of more than 15:1.  
This is the best deal on the planet.