# Metrics for sustainable food systems:

## Measuring progress and guiding investments

**GFFN Metrics Catalyst Group Brief**

gef

Good Food Finance Network

UN environment programme

WCMC

TRADE, DEVELOPMENT & THE ENVIRONMENT HUB

## Background

The Good Food Finance Network (GFFN) is a multi-stakeholder collaborative platform, working to develop the critical innovations that will allow sustainable food system finance to become the mainstream standard. The network is coordinated by EAT, FAIRR (Farm Animal Investment Risk and Return) Initiative, Food Systems for the Future, United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), and World Business Council for Sustainable Development. As part of its activities, GFFN organises catalyst groups around various topics to facilitate discussion and support the development of knowledge resources for achieving its goals.

The Metrics Catalyst Group, coordinated by the UN Environment Programme World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC) in partnership with UNEP, is intended to be a non-competitive and collaborative space, bringing together experts and practitioners on designing metrics and indicators for measuring progress toward sustainable food systems. Financial institutions and businesses that are part of the GFFN High Ambition Group were also invited to join the Catalyst Group.

The Metrics Catalyst Group intends to contribute to improved measurement of progress towards sustainable food systems by financial institutions by (a) increasing understanding of the challenges in measuring progress towards sustainable food systems and its importance, (b) identifying the need and opportunities for developing new metrics, and (c) increasing opportunities for cross-sectoral collaboration on sustainable food systems metrics.

This is the first brief published by the Metrics Catalyst Group. It was co-developed in partnership with the Trade, Development and the Environment Hub (TRADE Hub) of the UK Research and Innovation Global Challenges Research Fund (UKRI GCRF). TRADE Hub aims to make sustainable trade a positive force in the world by focusing on the impact of trade in specific goods and seeking solutions to these impacts. It conducts research on all stages of various agricultural supply chains, revealing damaging links and potential ways to make lasting change.

The purpose of this brief is to set the scene and identify general gaps and opportunities related to improving sustainable food systems metrics used by financial institutions. It provides a summary of the discussions during the first two meetings of the Metrics Catalyst Group, and will be used to help identify priorities moving forward. Following this initial brief, the Metrics Catalyst Group plans to publish thematic briefs, covering topics that have been identified as priorities in more detail.

## Members of the GFFN Metrics Catalyst Group

AMERRA Capital Management

CDP

Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR)

Climate Bonds Initiative

DuAgro

EAT

FAIRR Initiative

Fideicomisos Instituidos en Relación con la Agricultura (FIRA)

Food and Land Use Coalition (FOLU)

Food Systems for the Future (FSF)

Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition (GAIN)

Global Canopy

Global Environment Facility (GEF)

Global Farm Metric

Global Impact Investing Network (GIIN)

Green Climate Fund (GCF)

International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN)

Johns Hopkins University

Olam Food Ingredients

OmniAction

Planet Tracker

Rainforest Alliance

Signature Agri Investments

Stockholm Environment Institute

Sustainable Food Trust

United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)

United Nations Environment Programme Finance Initiative (UNEP FI)

United Nations Environment Programme World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC)

World Benchmarking Alliance

World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD)

World Wildlife Fund (WWF)

Yara International

# 1. The case for sustainable food systems metrics for financial institutions

**A global transition to sustainable food systems is needed.** To avoid ecological collapse and a global climate disaster, the world needs to be on a nature-positive and climate-resilient pathway that reverses biodiversity loss and reduces emissions by 2030.[1] At the same time, a sustainable supply and demand of healthy food has to be secured for a growing population. It is also essential to ensure that the well-being and rights of local communities and workers are respected.

**Unsustainable food systems lead to operational, legal and reputational risks for businesses and financial institutions.** To support the management of these sustainability risks, there is an increasing demand for credible reporting and disclosure across all food systems on matters of environmental, social, nutritional and economic sustainability.

### Defining sustainable food systems

As defined by the Scientific Group for the UN Food Systems Summit, a **sustainable food system delivers food security and nutrition such that the economic, social and environmental mechanisms for generating food are safeguarded for future generations**.[2]

**Financial institutions are uniquely positioned to accelerate the transition toward sustainable food systems.** Decisions made by financial institutions shape what other actors in the economy are able or incentivised to do. The Food Finance Architecture developed by the Finance Lever of the UN Food Systems Summit has identified six pathways through which financial institutions can shift capital out of unsustainable food assets and into nature-positive, inclusive, climate-smart and circular business models that create value for people, the planet and the economy. Financial institutions can (1) make disclosure against environmental, social and health risk metrics mandatory for accessing funds, (2) they can promote supply chain transparency and reporting, (3) they can develop new business models together with their clients, (4) they can scale and create fit-for-purpose financial products to unlock wider access to sustainably focused finance and financial services, (5) they can de-risk and mobilise private capital, and (6) they can pay for nature and its services and insure against sustainability-related risks.[2]

**Among the financial institutions active in food systems and agriculture, there is a growing recognition that metrics for assessing sustainability are needed to guide decision-making.** The current landscape of sustainability disclosure is very dynamic and the legislative environment is rapidly evolving. There is an increasing number of businesses making sustainability commitments related to agricultural production and food value chains. To monitor and verify performance against these commitments and to assess their own progress on the sustainability of their portfolios, financial institutions need robust and fit-for-purpose metrics.

**This brief aims to identify challenges, gaps and opportunities in the use and development of sustainable food systems metrics.** Authored by members of the GFFN Metrics Catalyst Group, which include financial institutions, agricultural corporations, metrics developers and NGOs, this brief seeks to aggregate cross-sectoral knowledge on priority areas of action to improve the landscape of sustainable food systems metrics.

## Defining metrics and frameworks

We define **'metric' as a system or standard of measurement used by financial institutions to assess risks, potential investments and measure progress of specific companies or entire portfolios**. This definition is consistent with the use of the concept by the Task Force on Climate-Related Financial Disclosures (TCFD) and Taskforce on Nature-related Financial Disclosures (TNFD) that are spearheading the advancement of assessment and disclosure metrics for use by companies across the world.

We **focus specifically on metrics intended for use by the financial institutions** for assessing environmental, social, nutritional and economic aspects of **food system sustainability**. The metrics can serve many purposes both pre- and post-investment. We are considering metrics focusing on direct operations at a given site, metrics focusing on any other section of the value chain (production, transport, storage, processing, packaging and waste) as well as metrics used at the corporate or portfolio level.

**Metric frameworks are collections of metrics** that are structured to serve specific purposes. They can have different subjects, target audiences or thematic focus.

# 2. Key challenges in using sustainable food systems metrics and potential solutions

When using metrics to assess the sustainability of their food and agriculture related assets, financial institutions face a number of challenges. Efforts to address these are needed to enhance the uptake of relevant and science-based metrics across the financial industry and shift capital flows toward sustainable food systems. This section summarises the key challenges faced by financial institutions in using sustainable food systems metrics and provides suggestions for potential solutions to these challenges that were identified by the GFFN Metrics Catalyst Group.

**Challenge #1: Lack of widespread understanding of what is a sustainable food system**

The first and most obvious challenge for financial institutions (and many other stakeholders) is that the **understanding of what represents a sustainable food system is not yet well-established across the food value chain**. The interconnectedness of environmental, social, economic and health aspects of food system sustainability means that it is difficult to understand which aspects of sustainability to focus on. This leads to variability in how food system sustainability is interpreted by different financial institutions and allows financial institutions to cherry-pick metrics to make their portfolios appear more sustainable.

**Potential solution:**

- **Build consensus on the comprehensive definition of sustainable food systems and their various elements** and raise awareness about best practices in the private sector. Initiatives that support food systems sustainability transition or that develop new food systems metrics should seek to align with the latest science-based definition of food system sustainability and ensure that metrics are in place to capture all aspects of sustainability.

**Challenge #2: Selecting appropriate metrics**

The second challenge is that financial institutions often find it **difficult to select the appropriate metrics to measure food systems sustainability as there is no silver bullet solution**. It is not possible to define a set of metrics that works in every business and location context and at all levels of the food system. The usefulness of a specific metric depends on (1) the type of financial institution using it for analysis, (2) the asset class being considered, (3) the industry in which the assessed business is operating, (4) the place in the value chain, (5) the regulatory environment, and (6) other local context.

**Potential solutions:**

- **Development of relevant sustainability risk management and disclosure recommendations** (e.g. TCFD, TNFD, ISSB and the anticipated Taskforce on Social Financial Disclosures (TSFD)) will help map out available sustainability metrics and put forward advice on which metrics may be relevant to different types of financial institutions and different economic sectors.
- Financial institutions looking for guidance on how to assess food systems sustainability can **use existing metric frameworks or certification schemes as templates for which metrics are relevant**, and tailor these to the business and location context of their assessment. An overview

of the most widely recognised metric frameworks covering aspects of food systems sustainability is available in Appendix 1.

- **Developing recommendations on core metrics** that all financial institutions should use to assess the sustainability of food systems would support alignment across financial institutions while allowing for adaptation to specific contexts by leaving the flexibility to add bespoke metrics if needed. The core set of metrics needs to be widely applicable and cover all key aspects of food systems sustainability. For financial institutions new to sustainable food systems, this would provide a foundation upon which they could build.

**Challenge #3: Access to data**

In many cases, it is **challenging for financial institutions to get good quality data to assess sustainability of food systems companies against relevant metrics**. To conduct robust analysis, reliable data are needed both for establishing a baseline and for monitoring performance over time. Monitoring, reporting and data verification are associated with costs that increase with the number of metrics that financial institutions need to monitor. However, the ease of collecting data should not be the key force that influences which metrics are being measured. For example, emissions reductions are much easier to measure than biodiversity loss or living income, but all these aspects are important for the sustainability of food systems.

**Potential solutions:**

- **Standards and guidance on food systems sustainability disclosure and reporting** will encourage companies to share non-sensitive sustainability data through publicly available reports or reporting frameworks, which will make sourcing of data more cost- and time-efficient. Financial institutions can support the mainstreaming of these practices by setting out their requirements for food systems sustainability data, including the need to collect this throughout supply chains, and collaborating with disclosure frameworks and standards developers.
- For screening investments and establishing context, financial institutions could **complement data reported by companies with data available from other sources**. They can do this by leveraging third-party data tools (e.g. IBAT, Global Forest Watch, and Ocean+) or publicly available national datasets (e.g. the Environmental Dataset Gateway in the US, Costa Rica's SNIT and SINIA, or the India Biodiversity Portal)[3].
- Development and use of **new technologies will generate new sustainability data.** For example, advances and reductions in the cost of environmental DNA (eDNA) analysis have enabled its use in monitoring certain biodiversity impacts. Mainstreamed use of the latest technology and software is also expected to increase **the usability of existing sustainability data.** For example, machine learning can be used to synthesize and reformat data from public repositories into formats that are more compatible with financial institutions' data systems.
- Financial institutions should **explore using partially incomplete or not entirely adapted datasets for estimates and proxies**. By starting to use these, financial institutions could begin to understand where they can take action and what data gaps remain. Doing so would also help them to build internal capacity on sustainability assessment methodologies and signal demand for better and more accessible data.
- Costs of data collection can be reduced by using **robust materiality assessments**. By analysing which activities of a business have the most significant positive or negative sustainability impacts, financial institutions can focus on these and streamline the selection of sustainability

metrics needed. The double materiality concept ensures that the needs and concerns of both society and the business will be properly addressed.

**Challenge #4: Limited technical capacity and expertise**

Many financial institutions have **limited expertise and capacity in assessing sustainability of food systems and using the metrics**. This can lead to sub-optimal decisions on capital allocation and corporate engagement. As a result, financial institutions can be disincentivised from shifting their capital allocation towards sustainable food systems.

**Potential solutions:**

- **Tailoring metrics guidance to the needs of investors** can help encourage their interest in the area and adoption of metrics. For example, GFFN Metrics Catalyst Group members found that European investors are placing a lot of emphasis on how their investments will align with the upcoming EU taxonomy of sustainable economic activities. On the other hand, North American investors are often more concerned about how investments relate to existing certifications, like LEED, B Corp and Green Business Bureau.
- While financial institutions are starting to strengthen their capacity on sustainability issues by upskilling existing staff and recruiting additional ones, metrics developers can **help build the capacity of financial sector stakeholders and develop tailored knowledge products**, such as information briefs about their metrics and how they can be used by financial institutions.

**Challenge #5: Attribution of responsibility for changes in performance against a metric**

With sustainability determined by a number of systemic factors, financial institutions can find it **challenging to identify sustainable food systems metrics that measure the performance of the assessed businesses and are not affected by the performance of other stakeholders**. For example, some metrics measuring the condition of land depend on the performance of several actors in the landscape.

**Potential solutions:**

- Developers of food systems sustainability metrics should **adhere to the boundaries of control of businesses** when determining which type of stakeholder should have the ownership or responsibility of data provision. For some sustainability aspects, metrics developers should explore combining business impact metrics (e.g. change in the size of the ecosystem due to land converstion around the business's production sites) with business response metrics (e.g. area of land used for business activity where regenerative land management practices are applied) to fully capture how the business performs in relation to that sustainability aspect.
- Financial institutions should **consider the relationship between the sustainability performance of the businesses they are assessing and the wider food systems in which they are located**. To account for the interplay of different actors within food systems, it can be useful to draw on tailored or example scenarios such as the climate scenarios recommended by the TCFD or nature scenarios in development by the TNFD.

# 3. Key gaps in sustainable food systems metrics

Assessing the sustainability of businesses requires consideration of a range of different aspects, including environmental, social, nutritional and economic ones. While there are a number of sustainable food systems metrics available, some areas are covered less than others. This section provides an overview of the key gaps in sustainable food systems metrics currently available to financial institutions mapped by the GFFN Metrics Catalyst Group.

**Gap #1: Lack of metrics covering all stages of the value chain**

In many thematic areas (including water, soil, biodiversity, plant and crop health, energy and climate) **sustainable food systems metrics do not cover all stages of the value chain equally**. They are most often concentrated towards the production end of the value chain, measuring the impacts of agriculture at the farm level where significant impacts are known to occur. Additional metrics are needed in these thematic areas at the consumption, distribution and processing stages of the value chain.

Nutrition metrics, on the other hand, are concentrated toward the consumption end of the value chain. There is a need for aligned metrics measuring the availability, accessibility and affordability of nutritious foods in earlier stages of the value chain where companies also play a crucial role in determining the nutritional outcomes of food systems.

**Gap #2: Lack of positive impact metrics**

There is a **need for more metrics on the positive impact of businesses in food systems**. Most currently available metrics focus on measuring potential negative impacts, which means that many positive impacts of food systems companies will not get captured. The use of positive impact metrics would help financial institutions identify opportunities stemming from shifting capital to sustainable food systems, and promote the development of novel financial mechanisms. When developing positive impact metrics, it will be important to communicate how these should be used and interpreted. Both negative and positive impact metrics need to be considered to provide accurate assessments.

**Gap #3: Lack of metrics focusing on outcomes**

Most currently available sustainable food systems metrics assess outputs or activities. Since not all outputs lead to the realisation of desired outcomes or impacts, **more outcome-level metrics are needed**. For example, a metric measuring the use of pesticides by an agricultural producer might be helpful in assessing the producer's efforts to reduce the negative impact on biodiversity, but looking solely at these output-level changes will not determine whether the agricultural producer is actually achieving reduced negative impact on biodiversity. Examples of outcome-level metrics can be found in the Accountability Framework Initiative's set of metrics for monitoring and reporting on deforestation and ecosystem protection.[4]

**Gap #4: Lack of metrics at the landscape or systemic levels**

To assess how food systems businesses are contributing to sustainability outcomes such as increased biodiversity protection or reduced economic inequality, it is often necessary to consider the changes at

the landscape or system level rather then just evaluating each business individually. There is a **need for more landscape or system-level metrics** as most of the currently available metrics have been focusing on measuring outputs or outcomes at a smaller scale. This is because data on these larger-scale outcomes is limited, especially for the outcomes that cannot be measured using satellite imaging. Public sources of data often provide data only at the national level and do not lend themselves to the measurement of changes at the landscape or system level. One example of an initiative working to develop a system for assessing landscape-level sustainability performance is LandScale, a collaboration between the Rainforest Alliance, Verra and Conservation International.[5]

**Gap #5: Lack of metrics measuring upstream and downstream impacts of a business**

When assessing the sustainability of a business, it is important to take into consideration also their upstream and downstream supply chain impacts. Most currently available food systems metrics are focusing on the business performance at location. **More metrics linking businesses to their upstream and downstream impacts are needed.**

**Gap #6: Insufficient metrics coverage of livelihoods, labour conditions and equality**

While there are a number of metrics measuring improved livelihoods available and in use, there are some livelihood outcomes that are less well covered by these. There is a **lack of metrics on living incomes**, which capture whether a business contributes to the improvement of livelihoods beyond the living income level. There is also a need for **metrics that capture non-income livelihood impacts** in food systems.[6] Several members of the GFFN Catalyst Group (WBCSD, WBA, Countdown, Global Farm Metric and UNEP-WCMC's TradeHub project) are working on developing these metrics, creating opportunities for collaboration to align their efforts.

**More metrics addressing labour aspects are needed** to measure the social impacts of companies. The development of metrics is being slowed down by a gap in the availability of reliable labour data. Measurement of labour practices is particularly challenging in countries without strong employment regulations and in countries with large informal economies where many workers have multiple jobs.

**Equality and rights metrics are also underdeveloped** categories of social metrics. While gender and racial equality metrics are becoming more common in the corporate world, they are not yet prevalent across the food systems. Indigenous people are often underrepresented in decision making, putting them at risk of exploitation. Gender inequality is known to be prevalent in some commodity supply chains.[7] Measuring whether positive impacts of food systems investments are reaching socially marginalised groups and whether their interests are addressed is essential to supporting transition towards sustainable food systems.

**Gap #7: Insufficient metrics coverage of climate change resilience**

Climate change resilience is a critical aspect of food systems sustainability. Climate change has an array of effects on businesses and the landscapes they are embedded in, creating different risk exposures for financial institutions to consider and monitor. These can form compound effects with those arising from nature loss. There is a **need for metrics that capture the level of resilience and adaptation to the different climate change effects** (e.g. water shortage resilience, resilience to major climate events, resilience to increased temperatures), including through the use of nature-based solutions.

**Gap #8: Insufficient metrics coverage of waste and plastic pollution**

Measuring the waste footprint of a business is a key component of measuring its sustainability performance. In food systems, two major types of waste that need to be reduced and sustainably managed are food waste and packaging waste. While these two types of waste have different drivers and require different responses, most waste metrics currently available to financial institutions do not differentiate between them. To support the assessment of the sustainability challenges businesses are facing, **more metrics that distinguish food waste and packaging waste are needed**.

Packaging waste is a major contributor to plastic pollution, which is affecting the sustainability across food systems. In a resolution from March 2022, the UN Environment Assembly has called for a UN treaty on plastic pollution to mobilise the momentum on limiting production and mishandling of plastic waste. **More metrics for assessing plastic pollution are needed** to allow financial institutions to assess business performance in this critical area.

**Gap #9: Insufficient metrics coverage of biodiversity**

While the importance of measuring biodiversity impacts and dependencies of businesses is becoming increasingly recognised, **metrics currently available and relevant to financial institutions do not capture all aspects of biodiversity**. For example, state of ecosystems and species-level measurement of extinction risk and population size tend to be insufficiently covered. As biodiversity cannot be fully captured through a single metric, in order to assess whether businesses are contributing to reversing biodiversity loss, financial institutions need to draw on a suite of metrics. An overview of approaches, tools and metrics to measure biodiversity in agricultural supply chains has been published in March 2021 by the Aligning Biodiversity Measures for Business collaboration.[8] There is also a need for **more biodiversity metrics that are spatially-explicit and consider the significance of biodiversity in the assessed locations**. Initiatives developing metric frameworks or combined metrics for assessing biodiversity should promote filing these gaps and seek alignment.

**Gap #10: Lack of metrics tracking ocean sustainability**

With increasing recognition of the importance of the blue economy and marine aquaculture, existing **metrics and metric frameworks need to be adapted to take into consideration the marine realm**. This will likely require the creation of new metrics that financial institutions could use to assess sustainability of ocean food systems.

# 4. Enabling environment for better sustainable food systems metrics

To mainstream the use of sustainable food systems metrics, we need to tackle the challenges and gaps outlined in the previous sections. This section summarises the priority actions to create an enabling environment for metrics developers to improve existing and develop new sustainable food systems metrics that could be used by financial institutions.

**Action #1: Improving coordination among metrics developers as well as between metrics developers and financial institutions**

Increasing the level of coordination across different metrics developers is required to support the alignment of sustainable food systems metrics across different initiatives. Metrics developers and financial institutions should also coordinate on filling the gaps in currently available sustainable food systems metrics and on addressing the challenges that financial institutions face when using these. This will prevent duplication, increase efficiency and promote increased uptake of the metrics.

**Action #2: Increasing funding for metrics developers**

Metrics developers have limited access to funding but play a crucial role in the sustainability transformation of food systems. Because the design and testing of metrics is resource intensive, the lack of financial support is slowing down the development of new metrics and improvement of existing ones. More funding for data collection and the development and improvement of metrics is needed, including through innovative solutions such as partnerships with financial institutions.

**Action #3: Collaborating with data providers**

Sustainability and ESG data providers are already supplying sustainability information to financial institutions, including on food systems. They are therefore uniquely placed to play an important role in mainstreaming use of sustainable food systems metrics. Strengthening coordination and engagement between metrics developers and sustainability data providers will help them align their efforts with each other's needs, opening opportunities for easier dissemination of metrics in the market.

**Action #4: Widespread testing of metrics and frameworks**

Piloting of new sustainable food systems metrics and the testing of existing ones in new contexts would greatly benefit methodological development and refinement. Metrics developers should explore opportunities for testing their metrics to gather feedback from both businesses intended to be assessed by the metrics and financial institutions expected to use them for assessments.

**Action #5: Increasing engagement from regulators**

Metrics developers would welcome increased engagement from regulators and policy makers, in particular more indication about how regulations on sustainability and its measurements are likely to evolve. This would allow metrics developers to better anticipate the financial institutions' needs and align their efforts to upcoming regulatory changes.

# 5. Looking ahead

This brief highlights the rising need for sustainable food systems metrics tailored to and used by financial institutions. While financial institutions' interest in measuring various aspects of sustainability in food systems is growing, there remain significant challenges in encouraging the uptake of new and lesser known metrics, and substantial gaps in the scope and thematic coverage of sustainable food systems metrics currently on offer. This brief has also emphasised the importance of closer coordination among initiatives developing sustainable food systems metrics as well as between these initiatives and financial institutions.

We encourage metrics developers and financial institutions to work together on filling the gaps in the currently available sustainable food systems metrics and on addressing the challenges that financial institutions face when using these. To support the transition toward sustainable food systems, other stakeholders (e.g. governments, research institutions, NGOs) should create an enabling environment that will accelerate these improvements.

The GFFN Metrics Catalyst Group will continue to capture lessons and identify potential solutions to these challenges. This first brief is intended to serve as an initial reference for further research and future efforts by the Catalyst Group, its members, financial institutions, and other stakeholders supporting mainstreaming of sustainable food systems metrics in finance. The next guidance briefs from the Catalyst Group will deep-dive into specific thematic areas, covering topics like climate change metrics and nature metrics for sustainable food systems.

# Appendix 1: Mapping existing sustainable food systems metric frameworks

Different metrics on sustainable food systems are relevant for different types of financial institutions and contexts. These metrics are organised into various frameworks, each with its unique focus and purpose. Table 1 below gives an **overview of the currently available sustainable food systems frameworks** by their users, scope, value chain focus, and thematic focus. A broader overview of tools and metrics related to agricultural trade has been developed by the TRADE Hub, along with an overview of biodiversity measurement approaches as part of a corporate needs assessment for agricultural supply chains[8].

| | | Data User | | | | | Value Chain Focus of Data | | | | | Thematic Focus of Data | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Commercial Bank | Insurer | Asset Manager | Asset Owner | Development Bank | Production | Handling & Storage | Processing | Distribution & Market | Consumption & Waste | Water | Soil | Productivity | Human Health & Nutrition | Social | Biodiversity | Plant & Animal Health | Animal Husbandry | Nutrient Management | Energy & Resource Use | Air & Climate | Food Loss & Waste | Anti-microbial resistance |
| Farm Level | Framework for Regenerative Agriculture (OP2B) | X | | X | | X | X | | | | | X | X | X | | X | X | | | | | | | |
| | Global Farm Metric (Sustainable Food Trust) | X | | | | | X | X | | | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | |
| Company Level | Food and Agriculture Benchmark (WBA) | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | X | X | | X | X | X | | X | X | | | | X |
| | FAIRR Protein Producer Index | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | X |
| | Smarter Metrics Guide (WBCSD) | X | X | X | X | | X | X | X | X | X | | | X | X | | X | | | | | X | X | |
| | Global Canopy Forest 500 Assessment Methodology | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | | | X | X | | | | | X | | |
| | FAIRR & GFI Alternative Protein Framework | | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | X | X | X | | | X | X | X | X | |
| Farm & Company Level | Agriculture Criteria (Climate Bonds Initiative) | X | | X | | X | X | X | | | | | | | | | | | X | | | X | | |
| | IRIS+ Sustainable and Smallholder Agriculture | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | | | X | X | | | | | | X | | | | |

## Disclaimer

The views expressed are those of the members of the Good Food Finance Network Metrics Catalyst Group convened by UNEP-WCMC in partnership with UNEP, and do not necessarily reflect those of other GFFN members, partners, and affiliations.

## Reference


1. Pörtner HO et al. *IPBES-IPCC Co-sponsored Workshop Report on Biodiversity and Climate Change*. IPBES and IPCC; 2021. Available from: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4920414

2. World Bank. *Food Finance Architecture : Financing a Healthy, Equitable, and Sustainable Food System*. Washington, DC: World Bank Group; 2021. Available from: https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/879401632342154766/pdf/Food-Finance-Architecture-Financing-a-Healthy-Equitable-and-Sustainable-Food-System.pdf

3. United Nations Environmental Programme. *Nature in a Haystack: Leveraging Public Nature-related Data in Disclosure Frameworks. Recommendations Based on an Assessment for Costa Rica, India, Indonesia, Mexico and South Africa.* Cambridge: UNEP-WCMC; 2022. Available from: https://www.unepfi.org/publications/nature-in-a-haystack-leveraging-public-nature-related-data-in-disclosure-frameworks/

4. Accountability Framework. *Operational Guidance and Monitoring and Verification.* Accountability Framework Initiative; 2019. Available from: https://accountability-framework.org/operational-guidance/monitoring-and-verification/

5. LandScale. How to Get Started. Available from: https://www.landscale.org/guides/how-to-get-started/ Accessed 14 October 2022.

6. Dreoni I, Schaafsma M and Matthews Z. *The Social Impacts of Cocoa Production: A Systematic Review*. UKRI GCRF TRADE Hub; 2021. Available from: https://tradehub.earth/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/The-Social-Impacts-of-Cocoa-Production.pdf

7. Kangile JR, Kadigi RMJ, Mgeni CP, Munishi BP, Kashaigili J and Munishi PKT. *The Role of Coffee Production and Trade on Gender Equity and Livelihood Improvement in Tanzania*. Sustainability. 2021; 13 (18): 10191. Available from: https://doi.org/10.3390/su131810191

8. Brooks S, Dimitrijevic J, Dunn K, Sehra K and Verstraeten Y. *Measuring the Impact of agricultural supply chains on biodiversity: A corporate needs assessment*. EU Business @ Biodiversity Platform and UKRI GCRF TRADE Hub; 2021. Available from: https://ec.europa.eu/environment/biodiversity/business/assets/pdf/2021/Measuring%20the%20Impact%20of%20Agricultural%20Supply%20Chains%20on%20Biodiversity_A%20corporate%20needs%20assessment.pdf

Published December 2022

Good Food Finance Network

UN environment programme WCMC

TRADE, DEVELOPMENT & THE ENVIRONMENT HUB