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1. BACKGROUND ON THE RESTORATION PERSPECTIVE

- Restoration aims to increase functionality of land in a sustainable way. Considers environmental, social and economic benefits across multiple ecosystems and land uses.

- The Global Restoration Initiative at WRI supports regional initiatives in Latin America and the Caribbean and Africa.
  - Relevant ecosystems

- The initiatives engage a broad audience that share an aim to advance a restoration agenda to deliver on multiple goals
  - National policy makers, practitioners, technical partners and private sector
  - The initiatives take into account landscape approach and competing agendas

- The initiatives work to motivate ambition and action on restoration, enable action through collaboration with technical partners.
  - Knowledge sharing is a basic component for impact

- Offer to support the establishment of ambitions and the technical assistance required to implement restoration at scale.
2. RELEVANT RECOLLECTION FROM THE BACKGROUND PAPERS

Rushton et al.
• Indicates of the potential costs from AMR and zoonotic disease risks when livestock/aquaculture systems are in close contact to human populations, thus expanding the notion of a landscape through the health interaction with people.

Herrero et al.
• Suggests that a land use perspective is necessary to harmonize management practices, forestry and land use sector – equivalent to adopting a landscape approach.

• Stresses for a truly sustainable intensification that does not fall into perverse incentives and leads to further expansion as a result of an increase in productivity.

• Provides clarity on the contribution of the sector to GHG and no just CO2 emissions - a better insight to inform land use planners who tend to use simplified indicators for prioritization of restoration activities.

• Broadly introduces some transformational innovations to potentially reduce the land use impact of livestock production.
3. SUMMARY OF SUGGESTIONS

From the restoration viewpoint
Communication & impact
• Making sure that the research reaches the community of practitioners or clients based on their objectives.
• Research and tools are facilitated to practitioners engaged in sustainable integrated management of landscapes.
• Further stress the need to break away from a linear production model and into an model considering healthy ecosystems.

Setting priorities
• Climate focus: The paper provides key points to summarize the emissions story for livestock activities. However, a focus on CO2 can lead to a misrepresentation of the true climate impacts of the sector.
• The objective would then be to provide more clarity on the GHG dynamics of the sector that result from differentiated livestock management and reference to research/tools that allow to expand on an association between methane, CO2, N2O and the land footprint of livestock.
• Improving information to strengthen position of land use/livestock activities in the climate agenda – potential of land use, specifically of livestock activities.

To Herrero:
• What guidance can be provided on the right incentives to trigger “the land sparring effect”.
• Reflect on the underrepresentation of some trade-offs from international trade of feed for livestock. What countries and individuals bear the environmental burden of feed exports? Impact on other countries’ progress towards SDGs?

To Rushton:
• Can traceability systems and standards for ASF play a role in reducing AMU (or appropriate use)? Providing higher value to products that result from better management and more formally established supply chains.