



Warsaw, 10 February 2025

**Ms Ursula von der Leyen, President of the European Commission,
Mr Christophe Hansen, Commissioner for Agriculture and Food,
Mr Olivér Várhelyi, Commissioner for Health and Animal Welfare,**

**European Open Letter from Scientists and Civil Society Organisations:
"Safe Food, Safe Planet, Safe Future"**

Introduction

We, the undersigned civil society organisations, members and representatives of the scientific community, who work every day for an agroecological and equitable transition towards sustainable food systems, including a better Common Agricultural Policy in line with the European Green Deal, hereby submit this letter to the Commission, advocating for a sustainable future and actively working to build sustainable food systems for the benefit of present and future generations.

Creating a sustainable, low-carbon economy requires comprehensive action involving regulatory and legislative policy, grassroots work, education and public awareness campaigns. Most importantly, this transition cannot succeed without addressing food systems and the associated challenges, particularly regarding the high-carbon production of meat and other animal products or food security, including qualitative and quantitative food poverty. It should be emphasised that the current food system based on expansive agriculture and animal farming is a major contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, which, together with food waste and environmentally



unsustainable agricultural practices, exacerbates the already serious climate-environmental crisis.

Safe food equals a safe planet. The two issues are just two different aspects of the same problem. Only by taking an integrated approach to security, including both ecosystem security and food security, can we ensure a stable and prosperous world for future generations.

The impact of the current food system on climate change, environment and human rights

Climate change is a process that negatively affects not only ecosystems, the environment or international economies, but also human rights, environmental rights and animal rights. The consequence of increased atmospheric emissions of greenhouse gases is harmful interference with the environment, which has a measurable impact on human health and life. One of the main emitters in this respect remains the food production sector, including above all food of animal origin, on which the current food system is based.

Climate change and environmental degradation

The links between climate change and the environment, and consequently food security, remain unquestionable. As the [report](#) of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (hereafter also: ‘IPCC’) points out:

‘Climate change has caused widespread adverse impacts and related losses and damages to nature and people. (...) Individual livelihoods have been affected through (...) loss of property and income, human health and food security, with adverse effects on gender and social equity.’

Climate change contributes to agricultural and environmental droughts, land degradation, causes significant agricultural losses negatively impacting on food quality and the ability to meet the



growing food supply, thus leading to problems with food production and water availability. Significant risks also include issues of antibiotic resistance and food contamination.

However, these dependencies do not focus solely on the negative impact of climate change on food security. In fact, it should be stressed that they are reciprocal and bidirectional in nature, due to the fact that greenhouse gas emissions generated by food production measurably contribute to the acceleration of progressive anthropogenic climate change per se.

As indicated in the [report](#) 'Red and processed meat in the context of health and the environment: many shades of red and green' prepared by the International Health Organisation (hereinafter also: 'WHO'):

'Red meat production has been identified as a key contributor to agricultural GHG emissions, relative to other types of food production. Together with dairy milk, red meat production contributes to 55% of total global agriculture emissions. Livestock-derived food more broadly accounts for 72–78% of total agriculture emissions, and, within this, cattle production contributes 80% of ruminant emissions. Predominantly, these emissions are in the form of methane and nitrous oxide. Methane emissions remain in the atmosphere for a shorter time than carbon dioxide, but are significantly more potent and continue to contribute a significant amount of warming – around 23–40% of the total.'

The Report explicitly points out that animal food production systems, including primarily cattle, sheep and pigs, generally generate the largest greenhouse gas emissions, which will increase with the expansion of animal farming and production. It should be noted that the global population of farmed animals has tripled over the last century, while the wild animal population has shrunk by more than 66%. Importantly, the high greenhouse gas emissions associated with



animal agriculture are also due to the production of animal feed, which is estimated to account for 55% of agricultural emissions worldwide.

These dependencies are also addressed in the [White Paper of the victims of the animal agriculture](#) sector by Dr. Sylwia Spurek, which clearly indicates that the animal agriculture sector contributes significantly to negative climate and environmental impacts, as:

'in Europe it is responsible for: 78% of land-based biodiversity loss, 80% of soil acidification and air pollution (ammonia and nitrogen oxides emissions) and 73% of water pollution (both nitrogen and phosphorus)'.

The animal agriculture sector is a significant emitter of greenhouse gases. Cows, bulls and calves are responsible for the largest share of greenhouse gas emissions, accounting for around 65% of the industry's total emissions.

In other words, science points to the climatic expansiveness of the global food system, which: *'from the production of fertilisers to the storage and packaging of food, it is responsible for a third of all human-induced greenhouse gas emissions'*.

At the same time, it should be emphasised that the climate impact of animal agriculture sector is [pointed out by the European Commission itself](#):

'EU agricultural emissions represent around one-tenth of the overall GHG emissions, of which roughly two-thirds come from livestock. Since 2005, emissions have stagnated- inventory data show a slow annual decrease of 0.7 MtCO₂-eq between 2005 and 2021. The latest GHG projections from Member States indicate that under existing measures the pace of emission cuts will not change by 2030 (1% compared to 2021, or an annual average reduction of 0.6 MtCO₂-eq). However, with additional measures, aggregated projected emissions from agriculture point



to a visible decline by 2030 (5%, or 2.2 MtCO₂-eq annual average reduction). It is clear that more effort is needed to implement mitigation measures in the agricultural sector.'

Consequently, it is clear that the current food system adversely affects both the climate and the environment, contributing to pollution and high GHG emissions.

Human Rights

The current food system also negatively affects widely recognised and protected human rights. Not to mention the difficulties in accessing vegan food as stated by residents of many European Union countries (including Poland), it is necessary to point out the working conditions in the agri-food sector and, independently, the standard of living of those living in the vicinity of industrial farms. As reports by social organisations indicate:

'In the case of farm workers, the most important risks are: injuries, mental problems, respiratory diseases, zoonoses, including infectious diseases. The intensive use of antibacterial preparations on farms contributes to the mutation of bacteria and the emergence of antibiotic-resistant strains. With regard to the inhabitants of the areas neighbouring the farms, in addition to the epidemiological risks associated with the aerosols and the pathogens they contain, the most troublesome and negative phenomena for health and well-being are odours, insects and infrasound noise. They cause physical discomforts such as irritation of the eyes, nose and throat and respiratory and digestive symptoms. They are a source of constant stress and significantly reduce quality of life. These nuisances are still not regulated in Poland.'

In addition, attention should be paid to the odour nuisance generated by industrial farms, which clearly interferes with the right to live in a clean environment and the right to clean air of the surrounding population.



Significant risks also include the issues of antibiotic resistance and food contamination.

In the context of antibiotic resistance, studies indicate that:

‘an increase in the use of medicinal substances in agricultural production is noted both in Poland and worldwide. The main problem is the lack of control over the sale and dosage of these substances in feed (...) The irrational use of antibiotics has contributed to the emergence of drug-resistant strains of bacteria against which antibiotics of last resort do not work. Bacteria exposed to antibiotics develop resistance mechanisms through various metabolic pathways. They are also able to pass on resistance genes to the next generation, and also between bacteria of different species. Excessive and often unjustified use of antibiotics, using them in inappropriate doses or by prematurely discontinuing antibiotic treatments has contributed to an increase in the building up of resistance mechanisms by bacteria.’

As the [WHO highlights](#):

‘The emergence and spread of drug-resistant pathogens threatens our ability to treat common infections and to perform life-saving procedures including cancer chemotherapy and caesarean section, hip replacements, organ transplantation and other surgeries. In addition, drug-resistant infections impact the health of animals and plants, reduce productivity in farms, and threaten food security.’

These dependencies have also been recognised by the European Union, as the European Green Deal itself [has already indicated](#) that:

‘The strategic plans will need to reflect an increased level of ambition to reduce significantly the use and risk of chemical pesticides, as well as the use of fertilisers and antibiotics (...) The Farm to Fork Strategy, will address the use of pesticides and fertilisers in agriculture’.



Notwithstanding the above arguments, the demonstrated lack of substantial progress towards the goals of the Farm to Fork Strategy calls for a more urgent and comprehensive approach to these issues, with a particular focus on the fundamental need to establish a sustainable food system.

The need for transformation

From the above, it can be concluded that the current food system is characterised by intensive and inequitable production, global and climatically and environmentally irrational supply chains, high consumption of natural resources, including water, and significant negative impacts on the environment, climate, public health and human rights. Global population growth, climate change and increasing consumption of meat and highly processed food further intensify the phenomena indicated. The transition to a more sustainable - secure food system is not only desirable, but necessary to ensure food security, environmental protection and the well-being of present and future generations.

As argued earlier, the agriculture and food sectors account for a significant proportion of global greenhouse gas emissions. Promoting a diet based on plant and alternative sources of protein, as well as sustainable agricultural practices such as reduced fertiliser use, organic soil conservation, agroforestry and sustainable animal agriculture, can significantly reduce greenhouse gas emissions and contribute to combating climate change and building resilient food systems.

To transform the food system, emphasis should also be placed on two other key areas, i.e. 1) strengthening product transparency legislation and 2) promoting green procurement. Transparent labelling that includes detailed information on carbon footprint, ingredient sources and cultivation methods will enable consumers and consumers to make more informed and environmentally friendly decisions. On the other hand, green procurement can increase demand



for low-carbon, locally sourced and sustainable food by promoting organic practices and supporting local farmers.

Building sustainable food systems remains perhaps the most pressing challenge for global and national policy makers such as the European Commission.

Sustainable food systems promote crop diversification, habitat conservation and environmentally friendly agricultural practices. They also advocate access to healthy, nutritious and safe food, including by reducing the consumption of processed foods, sugars, salt and saturated fats, and promoting a plant-based diet.

The creation of a sustainable food system that meets these criteria and is committed to these values remains essential for a clean and healthy environment, combating and healthy environment, the fight against climate change and, finally, the protection of human rights.

Priorities and recommendations

Starting with the definition of the food system as such, in the context of the subject of this position paper, it should be pointed out that:

'encompasses the whole range of actors and their related value-creating activities involved in the production, collection, processing, distribution, consumption and utilisation of food products from agriculture, forestry or fisheries, as well as parts of the wider economic, social and natural environment in which they are embedded. The food system is composed of subsystems (e.g. agricultural system, waste management system, input supply system, etc.) and interacts with other key systems (e.g. energy system, trade system, health system, etc.). Thus, a structural change in the food system may result from a change in another system; for example, a policy



promoting greater use of biofuels in the energy system will have a significant impact on the food system’.

Consequently, a sustainable - safe food system should be seen as:

‘a food system that ensures food security and adequate nutrition for all. The system encompasses everything from the processing, packaging and transportation of food to consumers’.

At the same time, there are three key indicators for determining whether a food system is sustainable, namely:

‘Economic sustainability - the system is viable throughout the cycle;

Social sustainability - it provides broad benefits to society;

Environmental sustainability - it has a positive or neutral impact on the environment’.

Consequently:

‘In developing a sustainable food system, sustainability is analysed holistically. For a food system to be sustainable, its development must simultaneously generate positive values in three dimensions: economic, social and environmental.

In the economic dimension, a food system is considered sustainable if the activities carried out by each participant in the food system or supporting service provider are commercially or fiscally viable. These activities should generate benefits or economic value for all categories of stakeholders: wages for workers, taxes for governments, profits for businesses and improved food availability for consumers.



In social terms, a food system is considered sustainable when there is equity in the distribution of added value, taking into account vulnerable groups defined, for example, by gender, age, race and other characteristics. It is also crucial that food system activities contribute to important socio-cultural outcomes, such as improved nutrition and health, preservation of traditions, working conditions and animal welfare.

In the environmental dimension, sustainability means that the impact of food system activities on the surrounding environment is neutral or positive. This takes into account biodiversity, water, soil, animal and plant health, carbon footprint, water footprint, food loss and waste, and toxicity.'

Creating a sustainable food system remains an objective that is also indicated in the European Union's political and legislative strategies, most notably through the use of the already mentioned Farm to Fork Strategy. As stated:

'in line with the strategy, it is necessary to change the way we produce, purchase and consumption of food to improve the environmental footprint and help mitigate climate change, while protecting the livelihoods of all operators in the food chain, generating fairer economic returns and opening up new business opportunities'.

In the [document](#) 'A Farm to Fork Strategy for a fair, healthy and environmentally-friendly food system' outlining the framework for this strategy, the European Commission clearly stated that:

'The sustainability of food systems is a global issue and food systems will have to adapt to face diverse challenges. The EU can play a key role in setting global standards with this strategy. It sets key targets in priority areas for the EU as a whole. In addition to new policy initiatives, enforcement of existing legislation, notably for animal welfare, pesticide use and protecting the



environment legislation, is essential to ensure a fair transition. The approach will take into account different starting points and differences in improvement potential in the Member States’.

At the same time, the key objectives of the Farm to Fork Strategy for 2030 are: 50% reduction in the use and risk of pesticides; at least 20% reduction in the use of fertilisers; 50% reduction in the sale of antibiotics used in animal agriculture and aquaculture; 25% of the agricultural area dedicated to organic farming.

However, given the lack of progress on the formal adoption of the strategy, there is a serious risk that none of these targets will be achieved.

The above does not alter the urgency of the issue and, therefore, the urgency of addressing it effectively. **We therefore call on the European Commission to express its support for a sustainable food system framework and comprehensive food policy reforms, in particular by taking steps to develop a real legislative framework for building the said system.**

Following the Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations, it should be stressed that in the process of building Sustainable Food Systems, the European Commission should take into account five key factors:

1. wages for workers,
2. return on assets (profits) for entrepreneurs and asset owners,
3. tax revenue for government,
4. benefits for consumers,
5. impact on the socio-cultural and natural environment.

The perspective adopted by the European Commission, together with the initiatives it intends to take, should include in particular:



1. Climate protection and adaptation actions to raise public awareness and contribute to the protection of health, human rights, climate protection, the environment and animal rights, promoting a sustainable economy and industry, energy transition, green public procurement, as well as actions focusing on the rights of consumers and raising their awareness on food and environmental protection.
2. Initiatives to combat climate disinformation and greenwashing, including the role of the agri-food industry. Climate disinformation and greenwashing are major barriers to building a sustainable food system. They mislead consumers, hinder informed choices and allow unsustainable practices to continue under the guise of caring for the environment. Implementing robust strategies to address these challenges is essential;
3. Organising a debate on the *Clean Industrial Deal*, i.e. strategies and initiatives to transform European industry, including by promoting investment in so-called ‘clean’ industrial technologies. The debate should take into account the role of the agro-food industry in environmental, climate and ecosystem pollution, as well as its impact on human life and health and the welfare of animals whose rights are violated. The Clean Industrial Deal represents an important opportunity to decarbonise and transform European industry, including the agri-food sector, to enhance sustainability. Engaging in an in-depth and informed debate on this issue is key to ensuring that policies and investments effectively support the development of a resilient and environmentally sustainable food system.
4. Development of the tenets and design of trade agreements (such as Mercosur) that should incorporate the highest climate, environmental and health standards. Currently, many trade agreements emphasise economic growth and market access, often neglecting environmental protection, public health and social justice. Incorporating sustainability principles into these agreements is crucial to creating a truly sustainable food system. Trade agreements should be explicitly designed to be consistent with the relevant Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), with a particular focus on SDG 2 (Zero



Hunger), SDG 3 (Good Health and Well-being), SDG 12 (Responsible Consumption and Production), SDG 13 (Climate Action), SDG 15 (Life on Land) and SDG 17 (Partnerships for the Goals).

Taking into account the ‘Strategic Dialogue on the Future of EU Agriculture’ launched in in January 2024 by the President of the European Commission, Ursula von der Leyen, which aims to develop a common vision for the future of EU agriculture and food systems by involving a wide range of stakeholders, the European Commission should also take into account the demands and recommendations arising from this Dialogue, and in particular the following demands:

1. *‘A new approach to deliver on sustainability (...) Strategic Dialogue proposes that the European Commission establishes a benchmarking system that will harmonize methodologies of on-farm sustainability assessments. (...) This benchmarking system should be based on common objectives, principles, and criteria, and include monitoring and verification tools with common metrics and indicators. (...) The benchmarking system for agriculture should measure where each sector and farm stands and thus help to navigate towards the best options, contribute to the development of appropriate labelling and certification systems, and carry out the necessary steps to increase sustainability standards.’;*
2. *‘Preparing a Common Agricultural Policy fit for purpose: The income support policy needs to be changed to meet current and future challenges, promote employment and to support the ongoing transition of agri-food systems towards more sustainable, competitive, profitable, and diverse futures. (...) The future CAP should focus on these central objectives: (1) providing socio-economic support to the farmers who need it most; (2) promoting positive environmental, social and animal welfare outcomes for society and (3) invigorating enabling conditions for rural areas. (...) Under its socio-economic objective, the CAP should deliver income support for certain active farmers, but in a much more targeted way. (...) Rewarding and incentivizing*



farmers to establish and to continue providing ecosystem services, environmental payments should go beyond what is required by EU legislation and aim at the highest ambition in a system to be linked to quantifiable results using robust indicators. (...) Reaching the EU's objectives in terms of agriculture and food production, rural development, climate neutrality, and biodiversity restoration requires a dedicated and commensurate budget that matches all ambitions in a balanced and equal importance. (...) Financial support to environmental and climate actions will need to substantially increase annually throughout the following two CAP periods, starting from the current share of budget for eco-schemes and agri-environmental and climate instruments.';

3. *'Promoting sustainability and competitiveness in trade policy: The European Commission should ensure greater coherence between its trade and sustainability policy. At the same time, the current approach to conduct negotiations on agriculture and agri-food should be reviewed. The European Commission must better recognize the strategic relevance of agriculture and food products in trade negotiations, undertake a comprehensive review of its negotiation strategies and review its method of conducting impact assessments prior to trade negotiations. Furthermore, stronger leadership is needed in the reform of the global trade policy framework.';*
4. *'Making the healthy and sustainable choice the easy one: The European Commission and Member States should adopt demand-side policies, which address agri-food systems as a whole, to create enabling food environments where balanced, less resource intensive, healthy diets are available, accessible, affordable, and attractive. (...) The European Commission should conduct a full review of EU food labelling legislation, as well as publish a report evaluating the current measures relating to the marketing to children. Moreover, fiscal tools in the form of tax reduction for consumers should be provided to foster coherent price signals and Member States should foresee measures to safeguard food affordability for lower income consumer segments through social and fiscal policies. Further actions should be also carried out by the European Commission and*



Member States to achieve a more upgraded framework for public procurement on sustainable food and enable food banks and other non-profit organizations to maximise their role.’;

5. *‘Enhancing sustainable farming practices:Urgent, ambitious, and feasible action is needed at all levels to guarantee that the sector operates within planetary boundaries and contributes to the protection and restoration of the climate, ecosystems, and natural resources, including water, soil, air, biodiversity, and landscapes. To advance into this direction, the Strategic Dialogue foresees specific recommendations to promote agrobiodiversity, to reduce external inputs as mineral fertilisers and pesticides, improve nutrient management, advance in the decarbonization of mineral fertilizers as well as develop and use biocontrol. At the same time, the European Commission and Member States need to continue to support organic production as well as agroecological farming practices. The Strategic Dialogue calls for the establishment of a well-resourced nature restoration fund (outside of the CAP) to support farmers and other land managers to restore and manage natural habitats at the landscape level.’;*
6. *‘Reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in agriculture:The European Commission and Member States should work on a coherent mix of policies, combining incentives and regulatory measures, that include: (1) the establishment of a comprehensive methodology to set a GHG emissions accounting system and specified goals for the different types of agriculture and its structural conditions; (2) a general pathway to boost the implementation of appropriate measures and promote access to investment across agriculture and territories in order to advance towards the established emissions reduction goals. Since technological approaches will not be enough to achieve the climate goals, more ambitious actions would be defined for the most problematic areas with the implementation of territorial strategies supported by the Agri-food Just Transition Fund.’;*



7. *'Creating pathways for sustainable animal farming in the EU: The European Commission should set up a process for developing a strategy on the role of animal farming based on robust scientific evidence and the consultation of all stakeholders concerned. This should incorporate concrete pathways for action, including, among others, financial support for investment, advice and education, support for practical and advanced technological solutions for emissions reduction and the promotion of innovative circular-economy approaches. In areas of high concentration of livestock, long-term solutions need to be locally developed and funded using the Agri-food Just Transition Fund. Moreover, a revision of the animal welfare legislation is needed, as well as a new regulatory framework for an EU-wide animal welfare labelling scheme.'*;
8. *'Further action to better preserve and manage farmland, promote water-resilient agriculture, and develop innovative plant breeding approaches: The European Commission should establish, together with Member States and the European Parliament, a legally binding objective of 'no net land take by 2050'. Furthermore, the European Commission should launch a new European Observatory for Agricultural Land (see C.3.1.). Also, action is needed to facilitate the adaptation of agriculture to changing climatic and environmental conditions and promote investments and practices to advance towards water-resilient and less resource intensive farming. A comprehensive and sustainability-oriented system supporting innovations in plant breeding needs to be developed to maintain yields under increasingly challenging climate conditions. The European institutions should continue to develop the European breeding model, safeguarding freedom of choice while recognizing the contribution of small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) and farmers.'*;
9. *'Building an attractive and diverse sector: Generational renewal in the agri-food sectors needs to be boosted, creating a momentum for transition. Facilitating land mobility, adequate financial support, and better education are crucial to attract young farmers to the sector. Socially just working conditions in the agri-food sector are needed and require*



further action. The promotion of skills, better job opportunities and fairer working conditions through training and social dialogue would attract and retain agricultural workers. Gender inequalities and lacking diversity in the sector need to be better addressed. The vitality and attractiveness of rural areas must be significantly raised by implementing the long-term vision for rural areas and establishing a European rural contract.’;

Our appeal to the European Commission

We therefore call on the European Commission to recognise the development of sustainable food systems as key to long-term climate, environmental and health security and to integrate this priority into policies related to climate, environment, health, consumer rights and consumers, industry and animal welfare.

Consequently, we ask the European Commission to start work on a new legislative initiative on sustainable food systems, which could ultimately take the form of a comprehensive ‘*Safe Food*’ legislative package,. It should explicitly address the following issues:

1. **the right to information**, including the revision of food labelling regulations, which is crucial for the realisation of the right to product information, thus increasing awareness, changing eating habits and ultimately increasing public pressure to raise food safety levels. In addition, it is important to increase access to technologies for obtaining information about food, its origin and impact, so that new technologies are used in both social processes (increasing public awareness) and political processes (increasing public pressure on the market and decision-makers). Food labelling is not only a right to information, but also a right to safety, health and protection of vulnerable groups. Proper labelling protects the rights of women, minorities, people with disabilities and those at risk of poverty. As a basic good, food should be addressed by the Community and Member States in public health, social policies,



protection of minority rights, the fight against food poverty, environmental protection and climate policies..

2. **green public procurement**, including in particular the prevention of food waste, and independently by increasing the availability of local, sustainable, ethical food in educational, social and health facilities. Also, the Public Procurement Directive should be revised to prohibit Member States from making selections solely on the basis of price and instead introduce a ‘best value’ criterion, taking into account criteria such as sustainability, food quality, safety of local communities and ethical origin in the context of animal rights. As a result, the revision should also include setting precise targets for Member States to progressively increase the procurement of sustainable food, taking into account environmental, social, animal welfare, nutrition and socio-economic aspects, including shortening supply chains and supporting local producers. To support the sustainable food market, the revision of Directive 2014/24/EU should include minimum standards for organic products, sustainable small farms and fair trade. It is also important to promote a varied, balanced diet and support rural communities. Financial, technical and training support should be provided for those involved in public procurement to correctly apply the ‘best value’ principle instead of focusing only on the lowest price.
3. **food waste**, which requires reviewing and updating the targets established so far, along with taking into account the role of the production sector and processing, as well as the responsibility of distributors, especially large retail chains. EU targets must be adapted to climate, social and environmental challenges. The European Commission should introduce appropriate legislation to support a sustainable food system, with an emphasis on eliminating inequalities that favor large producers and distribution chains and exclude small suppliers and those with lower incomes. There should also be a focus on legislation to address food waste, particularly in the animal



agriculture sector, which contributes to significant food waste, environmental pollution and climate change.

4. **mass catering**, which updates the need to amend the EU School Scheme, which has been promoting the distribution of fruits, vegetables and dairy products in schools since 2017. Here we call for the inclusion of plant-based milk substitutes and the introduction of criteria for the quality and origin of the food and its environmental impact, which are currently ignored. The program, while aimed at improving children's eating habits, should better support the goals of sustainable production and consumption, in line with the Common Agricultural Policy 2023-2027 and the Farm to Fork Strategy. It is essential to align activities with the challenges of modern agriculture and societal needs, so that the program can effectively contribute to the EU's long-term health and environmental goals.

With this in mind, on behalf of the signatories of the letter and the Future Food 4 Climate Coalition, we request a meeting with representatives of the European Commission, including, in particular, Ms. Ursula von der Leyen, President of the European Commission, Mr. Christophe Hansen Commissioner for Agriculture and Food, Mr. Olivier Várhelyi, Commissioner for Animal Health and Welfare, to discuss the legislative demands presented regarding sustainable food production and consumption, including issues related to food waste in the animal agriculture sector. The meeting will provide an excellent opportunity to discuss proposals that aim to align EU policies with climate, social and health challenges.

Yours sincerely,

Anna Spurek, Green REV Institute

The signatories of the European Open Letter of scientific people and civil society organisations
“Safe food, safe planet, safe future”:



I. Civil society organisations

1. Future Food 4 Climate Coalition
2. 9dwunastych
3. Akcja Demokracja
4. Akcja Uczniowska
5. Azyl Świnki Lili
6. Bieganizm
7. BoMiasto
8. Fundacja Compassion in World Farming Polska
9. DaleKOWzroczne
10. Daniel Petryczkiewicz
11. DiversityPL
12. Dolina Bawole Serce
13. Earth Day Everyday
14. ECO EDU kids
15. Ekow wyborca
16. Federacja Wegan dla Zwierząt
17. First Step
18. Foodsharing Polska
19. Foodsharing Toruń
20. Fundacja “Ekopotencjał – Przestrzeń Możliwości”
21. Fundacja Aquila
22. Fundacja Centrum Edukacji Baza
23. Fundacja Chlorofil
24. Fundacja To Proste
25. Fundacja Impuls
26. Fundacja Klub Myśli Ekologicznej



27. Fundacja Lambda Polska
28. Fundacja MARE
29. Fundacja Ne_Ni
30. Fundacja Perspektywa
31. Fundacja Prawnej Ochrony Zwierząt Lex Nova
32. Fundacja ProVeg
33. Fundacja Psubraty
34. Fundacja Rething
35. Fundacja Rzecz Społeczna
36. Fundacja Szkatułka
37. Fundacja Zielone Światło
38. Fundacja Zwierzęta Niczyje
39. Gdańsk bez granic
40. Głos Pokolenia
41. Green teenager
42. Grupa Społeczni Opiekunowie Drzew - Toruń
43. Halo Tu Fauna
44. Instytut Przeciwdziałania Wykluczeniom
45. invECO
46. Istota
47. Klimatyczny Kopernik
48. Kolektyw Przełom
49. Koło Naukowe Praw Człowieka i Kryzysów Humanitarnych
50. Kompostuj Z Nami
51. Kongres Ruchów Miejskich
52. Lokalni Liderzy
53. Miastozdzczenie



54. Mikołów - Roślinne Yeah
55. Misja: Rozwój
56. Młodzieżowy Strajk Klimatyczny
57. NO PAIN IN YOUR BRAIN
58. Oficyna 21
59. Open Dialogues International Foundation
60. Plant Your Home
61. Podróże z Pazurem
62. Polska Dla Zwierząt
63. Pomorskie Stowarzyszenie Aktywni Lokalnie
64. Projekt Kaczuchy Dziennikarskie
65. Przestrzeń do życia
66. Pudełko Lilki
67. Rodzic w Mieście
68. Rodzice dla Klimatu
69. Roślinna Strona
70. RUCH zaNIEdban
71. Śląski Ruch Klimatyczny
72. Społeczna Straż Ochrony Zieleni Szczecina
73. Stowarzyszenia Mężczyźni Przeciw Przemocy
74. Stowarzyszenia Protest Porszewice
75. Stowarzyszenie "Nasz Bóbr"
76. Stowarzyszenie Jestem na pTAK!
77. Stowarzyszenie Kraków dla Mieszkańców
78. Stowarzyszenie LUWIA
79. Stowarzyszenie MOST
80. Stowarzyszenie Mudita



81. Stowarzyszenie na rzecz Azylu dla Świń Chrumkowo
82. Stowarzyszenie Przyjaciele Kubusia
83. Stowarzyszenie Równość
84. Stowarzyszenie Stop Stereotypom
85. Stowarzyszenie Tarnowska Rospuda
86. Szczera Sfera
87. Szkolna Młodzieżowa Rada Klimatyczna
88. Świadomi prawa
89. Vege Vouge
90. W imię zwierząt
91. Wawelska Kooperatywa Spożywcza
92. Wegaństwo - podcast
93. Wegrateka
94. Wiosna bez Barrier
95. WORLDmates
96. Wygadajmy Przyszłość
97. Zielone Wiadomości
98. Fundacja Reaktyw
99. Stowarzyszenie Społeczno - Oświatowe Gminy Międzyrzec
100. Fundacja Onkologiczna Rakiety
101. Zespół Ochrona Środowiska/Klimat Inicjatywy "Nasz Rzecznik"
102. Stowarzyszenie Centrum Wsparcia "Just Do It"
103. Fundacja Ludzie z Natury
104. Polskie Stowarzyszenie Zero Waste
105. UNEP/GRID-Warszawa
106. Fundacja DAR LOSU
107. Fundacja Rak'n'Roll. Wygraj Życie!



108. Stowarzyszenie Ekologiczne EKO-UNIA

109. Stowarzyszenie Dziedzictwo Podlasia

110. Nauka dla Przyrody

II. Scientific community

1. prof. dr hab. Piotr Skubała, University of Silesia in Katowice, Faculty of Natural Sciences, Team Europe Direct
2. dr hab. prof. Joanna Hańderek, Jagiellonian University in Cracow, author, member of the Humanist Society
3. dr hab. Piotr Krajewski, University of Łódź
4. dr Robert Maślak, University of Warsaw, Faculty of Biological Sciences
5. dr Ryszard Kulik, Doctor of psychology, ecologist and naturalist. School of Integral Ecopsychology SIE
6. mgr inż Iwona Kibil, dietician
7. prof. nadzw. dr hab. inż. Tadeusz Pomianek, University of Information Technology and Management in Rzeszow
8. dr Małgorzata Gosek, University of Information Technology and Management in Rzeszow
9. dr hab. inż. Jan Krupa, Department of Management, University of Information Technology and Management in Rzeszow
10. dr hab. Roman Żurek, Department of Ecological Research in Cracow
11. prof. dr hab. Andrzej Elżanowski, University of Warsaw
12. prof. dr hab. Jan Cz. Dobrowolski, Institute of Nuclear Chemistry and Technology, National Medicines Institute
13. dr Anna Kujawa, Polish Mycological Society
14. prof. dr hab. Beata Gabryś, University of Zielona Góra



15. prof. dr hab. Jerzy M. Gutowski, Forest Research Institute, Department of Natural Forests in Białowieża
16. dr Mirosław Stepaniuk, Podlasie Heritage Association
17. prof. Dr hab. Wojciech Pisula, Institute of Psychology Polish Academy of Sciences
18. dr hab. Anna Kałuża, University of Silesia
19. Małgorzata Burchard-Dziubińska, University of Łódź
20. prof. dr hab. Joanna Pijanowska, Department of Biology, University of Warsaw
21. dr Marzena Cypryńska-Nezlek, Action Centre for Climate and Social Transformation, SWPS University
22. prof. dr hab. Ewa Bińczyk, Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń
23. dr. hab Paulina Kramarz, Department of Biology, Jagiellonian University in Cracow
24. dr hab. Jakub Kronenberg, University of Łódź
25. prof. dr hab. Jolanta Tambor, University of Silesia in Katowice
26. prof. dr hab. Bernadeta Niesporek-Szamburska, University of Silesia in Katowice, Interdisciplinary Research Centre for Humanities Education
27. dr Ewa Półtorak, University of Silesia in Katowice, Interdisciplinary Research Centre for Humanities Education