

# FOOD SYSTEMS DIALOGUES (FSDs), JUNE 13<sup>TH</sup>, 2018

## EAT STOCKHOLM FOOD FORUM

SUMMARY REPORT | SEPTEMBER 6TH, 2018

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

WHAT TOOK PLACE?	1
WHAT WERE THE RESULTS?	3
SYNOPSIS OF THE TWO ROUNDS OF DIALOGUES	4
<b>Round One Synopsis: Eight Dialogue Tables on Organizing the FSDs</b>	4
<b>Round Two Synopsis: Eight Tables Discussed Specific Themes</b>	6
ANNEX 1: READOUTS FROM INDIVIDUAL DIALOGUE TABLES	8
ANNEX 2: AGENDA	19
ANNEX 3: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS	20

### WHAT TOOK PLACE?

In the early morning of June 12<sup>th</sup> more than 30 senior delegates at the SFF took part in a one-hour information meeting about the FSDs where they offered a range of valuable suggestions about design and implementation. The general view is that the FSDs have enormous potential, that there should be a clear appreciation of what would be a successful outcome, and that the FSDs should then be advanced in multiple locations and at local, national, regional and global levels with carefully constructed support systems to maximize both quality and impact.

It was stressed that the Dialogues have to have a food systems focus and that the rationale would ideally be explained to participants before-hand. The FSDs should be designed in a careful and purposeful way – and not be rushed. At the same time, the subject matter is urgent so the programme for advancing the FSDs in multiple locations should be put in place as soon as possible. The Dialogues should be conducted in a way that enables differences of opinion to be reflected at dialogue tables. Food-related emotions and scientific debates are both seen to have their place. But there will also be increased understanding of each other's' positions and that will result in more agreement among actors and better alignment of their efforts.

The Dialogues were described as a promising means for building trust through shared appreciation of why different positions exist. The patterns that emerge in the Dialogues will coalesce and take shape over time. The FSDs therefore should not be structured too tightly so as to allow unexpected patterns to emerge and take their own shape.

Fast forward 24 hours to 13<sup>th</sup> June. The 5-hour FSDs session started at 0800 with a short plenary with Gunhild Stordalen (EAT), Peter Bakker (WBCSD) and Sean de Cleene (WEF) from the initiating organizations. They shared their concept for the Dialogues and expressed their hope that they will advance agreement for food system transformation among ever increasing numbers of actors. Participants then heard about the initial design. At 845 the leaders and about 20 participants left to

attend other meetings to which they were committed. Around 80 participants – from business, civil society, scientific organizations, governments and multilateral bodies. They were each invited to join one of 8 round tables with only one request - that they do their best to link up with those with whom they do not normally interact.

Two process facilitators were identified for each table: they were asked to manage the discussions by first ensuring that participants agreed on a code of conduct to enable all present to be heard. Each table was also joined by an output producer who ensured that the results of the Dialogue were noted: these were used as a basis for report-back. The process facilitators and output producers were briefed on their roles and are already providing invaluable feedback on how these Dialogues are best conducted.

The participants at each Dialogue table were invited – in the first round - to consider the core elements of the FSDs concept and then to feed-back to the whole group with their own suggestions. Some focused most on what should be discussed and who should be in the discussion. Others looked more at when and where the Dialogues should take place, or how success should be measured. All found it useful to have an appreciation of why it is necessary to focus on food systems, and a basic vision of the food systems transformations necessary for realizing the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

The feedback from the first round was extremely rich, lasted for around an hour, involved much sharing of ideas across the whole group, and was completed by 1130 am.

Participants then selected one of eight different themes:

Access to nutritious, sustainable and healthy diets	Build the economic case and incentives
Enable carbon neutrality and adaptation to climate	Galvanize innovation and technology
Increase efficiency and transparency across value-chains	Enable smallholders to increase livelihood resilience – especially women and youth
Restore ecosystems and promote biodiversity	Understanding the contribution of Oceans

Participants then went into a second round of Dialogues, in different groupings, joining the table focusing on their selected theme. They were asked to propose ways in which a systems approach could be applied to their theme, and could help with the appreciation of key challenges, trade-offs and opportunities. They were also asked to consider how they – as individuals, or within their organizations - could help accelerate opportunities for transformation through multi-stakeholder collaboration. Despite the short time they came up with a range of interesting ideas that many said they would not normally have considered.

The table facilitators fed back briefly from this second round by 1255: several participants reported their reflections. The event closed just after 1310. We had expected many participants to leave during the FSDs session to catch planes or attend competing meetings but were surprised to count 70 in the room when the event closed at 1310. We were also delighted to be joined by the leader of the Climate-Smart African Agriculture Youth Network, Divine Ntiokam, from Cameroon, by Skype.

At the close of the event the curator indicated that all registered participants will receive the draft synthesis of the outcomes of each dialogue by email. They will have the opportunity to comment on the extent to which the synthesis serves as a true reflection of their Dialogue before it is posted on the FSDs website. If they wish, participants can be kept informed about (and invited to contribute to) plans for future FSDs, as well as to participate in future FSDs as we will attempt to maintain continuity between them.

## WHAT WERE THE RESULTS?

The main focus of participants in the session was on how the FSDs should be designed and implemented for the greatest impact. The atmosphere was universally positive: participants seemed energized both by the FSDs process and its potential. They wanted to be sure that it is informed by, and feeds in to, other processes including the Committee on World Food Security (CFS). They focused on the importance of advancing the FSDs at local level. 8 participants indicated that they would – individually or through their organizations – like to host regional, national or local level Dialogues in the coming months.

The syntheses of reports from the different Dialogue round tables are now being prepared from the “First Dialogues Report” – a transcription of the materials prepared by the output producer and presented by a process facilitator from each table (see Appendix 1 for an extract from this report). Here are some initial results of soundings from facilitators and output producers in the last three days.

**There is a need for descriptions of what is intended for the FSDs:** This initial FSDs session illustrated the need for understandable descriptions of what the Dialogues are designed to do, how they are being established, how they are being supported, what would be seen by the initiators as a success in two years’ time.

**Support for a vision of sustainable food systems and focus on poorer communities:** There was general support for a comprehensive vision of sustainable food systems that has been evolving within the context of the Stockholm Food Forum. This has four parts: (1) enabling all to access food that is nutritious and healthy (including through reducing loss and waste) always; (2) regenerating ecosystems, and caring for soils, oceans, forests and biodiversity; (3) reducing atmospheric carbon emissions and supporting adaptation of livelihoods to climate change; (4) contributing to resilient livelihoods for poorer people – especially those in young people and women in rural areas. There was specific focus at all tables on the interests of the billions of poorer people in our planet - smallholder farmers, landless people, those earning less than \$2 a day – who frequently are not able to make choices about what they eat or how their food is produced.

**Appreciating the need for a living systems approach:** The need for a living systems approach (i.e. people as well as food) was appreciated by many who participated in this group of FSDs though there were various interpretations of what that entails. But it did lead to engaged debates at the tables and seemed to be helpful to many. While most agreed that table themes are needed, they also stressed that the Dialogues should not primarily be technical discussions on narrow issues, that diversity at the table is essential and that non-directive facilitation is needed to ensure that they are productive.

**Reflections on moving forward:** Here are some summary reflections based on preliminary soundings.

- (1) The FSDs have enormous potential if taken forward through skilful curation and facilitation at multiple levels.
- (2) Outcomes of one set of Dialogues should be shared with, and (where relevant) incorporated into, other Dialogues within the level and into other levels (i.e. Glocal).
- (3) Eventually the Dialogues might evolve as a multi-centred collective effort that leads to greater agreement on issues and approaches in relation to Food Systems. This can be expected to speed up the transformation to sustainable food systems.
- (4) For this to happen, a “Dialogue in a box” kit is needed and means for mentoring curators, facilitators and output producers will be needed.

(5) The initiating organizations have offered consistent support for the first two years: success over this period will depend on the FSDs being carefully set up in ways that take account of as many different interests as possible.

(6) The Dialogues must be fully open – including to those who do not normally talk in groups about food systems issues.

(7) The results of Dialogues should feed into the multiple debates associated with decision-making about Food Systems.

**An organic evolution:** The general view is that the FSDs need to be enabled to evolve in an organic way without too much direction on content or conduct, though the synthesis of results is key to success. The reference group is an important sounding board. The timetable of coming events needs to be developed speedily and arrangements must be made so that adequate support is provided for the evolution of the FSDs.

**Support for the evolution to happen:** The FSDs need three kinds of support: The first is practical support – the connections (to help get people in the room) and logistics (to make sure that things work). The second is technical support – information that helps to animate the Dialogue. Participants may seek scientific information on multiple issues – including human needs or science-based pathways, demand trends, financial flows or patterns of trade. They may seek analytical frameworks that set out characteristics of different food systems and the forces that drive them. They may want to know more about the range of positions taken on each issue and potential trade-offs that need to be considered. Participants will value receiving such information as written material in advance or hearing it from specialist informants – in person or via video – before or during the Dialogues. The third is goodwill: the curators of different Dialogue sessions, as well as the process facilitators of individual Dialogues and the output producers, need consistent backing as they seek out pathways for Dialogue, and options for advancing Food Systems Transformation, that are both challenging and constructive.

**Potential for cascading:** The FSDs have the potential to cascade forward in multiple locations and – through constant synthesis and aggregation – to evolve as a powerful force for transformative change. This collective energy can only achieve its full potential if it is strongly supported by teams that are able to stretch out in response to ever-growing demands for support and encouragement. This means ensuring capacity for effective facilitation, outcome development and synthesis of dialogue outputs, posting on www and communicating the outcomes widely in multiple forums.

## SYNOPSIS OF THE TWO ROUNDS OF DIALOGUES

### ROUND ONE SYNOPSIS: EIGHT DIALOGUE TABLES ON ORGANIZING THE FSDS

- I **How to ensure that the FSDs encourage collective action for transformation of food systems?**
  - a. **Dialogue tables to tackle specific issues:** To prevent Dialogues being unfocused and generalized it is best if each table considers a specific issue. The specificity makes it more likely that the dialogue is meaningful to participants.
  - b. **Local level Dialogues especially needed:** The dialogue table should examine the issue from local, national, regional or global points of view: Dialogues at the local level are particularly relevant and should be encouraged.
  - c. **Adapting Dialogues to context:** Each dialogue session should be adapted to the context in which it takes place with regards to structure, approach and location.

- d. **Participants reflecting their own experiences:** A dialogue is more realistic and meaningful if participants share examples that reflect situations which they have experienced in their own localities or organizations.
- e. **Organizers proposing specific issues:** Dialogue organizers should propose several specific issues and participants should choose those which they wish to discuss.
- f. **Organizers selecting issues if time is short:** If time is short the organizers should select the issue to be considered by each table based on the interests of participants.
- g. **Encouraging consistent participation between Dialogue sessions:** It will be helpful if the same participants examine a specific issue in several sessions over time: they could request (and receive) information that can be made available from one of these Dialogues to the next.
- h. **Enabling expert informants to join Dialogue tables:** Participants might appreciate being able to invite persons with the required expertise or experience to join the dialogue table in order to provide additional information (if such experts are available at a dialogue session).
- i. **Ensuring skilled facilitation – importance of mentoring:** Skilled and well-prepared facilitators will be crucial Dialogues to be constructive: a process to mentor the facilitators will help to ensure consistency.

## II What combination of actions and actors could expand the impact of the FSDs?

- a. **Approaching each issue from multiple perspectives:** The participants at each table should consider their specific issue from different disciplinary, sectoral or stakeholder perspectives with care taken to engage those who are implicated with relatively little power and influence seek at a dialogue table should be examined from the perspectives of different stakeholders.
- b. **Mapping stakeholders:** To ensure that all relevant stakeholders are present when a specific issue is discussed at a Dialogue Table, a thorough stakeholder mapping process should take place before each FSDs Dialogue Session.
- c. **Conducting the Dialogues:** A Dialogue Table should be a space where all voices have equal time, opportunity and weight, regardless of participants' different backgrounds, institutional affiliations, status and power over resources.
- d. **Making space at the Dialogue table for those new to the process:** Participants in a FSDs session may not be confident about the idea of expressing opinions, or uncomfortable about doing this at the dialogue table. Before and during each session, all participants who are new to the process should be briefed, encouraged to share concerns with the table in advance of each specific dialogue, and given any support that they might need with expressing their perspectives.
- e. **Facilitators taking into account principles of inclusive participation:** The principles for the conduct of each Dialogue should be taken into account when decisions are made about who is to facilitate, where FSDs sessions are located and how individual Dialogues are structured.
- f. **Recording and dissemination of Outcomes:** The outcomes of each dialogue table should be recorded, presented briefly to other tables before the session ends, shared in draft with the session participants then posted on the Dialogues website.
- g. **Building momentum through continuity of Dialogue participants:** To ensure that each dialogue has impact beyond its immediate outcomes, the FSDS secretariat should establish a process for building momentum from one dialogue session to the next: this will ensure continuity of dialogue decisions as well as solutions proposed and other outcomes.
- h. **Enabling participants to make good use of outcomes from Dialogue Tables:** The secretariat should consider how participants can draw on the outcomes of Dialogue Tables in which they have participated and champion these outcomes within their spheres of influence – be they community organisations, businesses or institutions.

- i. **Enabling participants to stay in contact with the FSDs process:** Participants who wish to stay connected in the FSDs process should be able to do so through mechanisms that are established and maintained by the support team.
- j. **Stages of follow-up:** preparing the synthesis report took several person hours and needs to be budgeted for in future. An evaluation form will be sent to all participants together with this report.

### III How did the dialogue journey go?

- a. **The journey seemed to be productive for most participants:** The outcomes of the first round of Dialogues reflected the diverse range of voices at the table and provided a rich source of information, ideas and perspectives. The notes above reflect points that clearly came through in the eight first round Dialogue tables.
- b. **Identifying elements of success:** a positive and constructive spirit throughout the Dialogues was made possible through (a) facilitation by experienced chairpersons (b) effective process support from table note-takers and (c) the calibre and enthusiasm of the participants. Divergent views were aired, listened to and responded to respectfully. Dialogue tables reached a consensus on discussion points often – perhaps because they had come together for the preceding 2 days at the Stockholm Food Forum and were used to debating the issues.

## ROUND TWO SYNOPSIS: EIGHT TABLES DISCUSSED SPECIFIC THEMES

### I What are the key challenges, trade-offs and opportunities?

- a. **Inequalities in food systems:** Inequalities in current food systems is an issue that needs to be addressed in different ways, at different levels. The Dialogues are an opportunity to bring together those who are doing well, as well as those who are doing less well. They can help identify pathways to a more equitable spread of assets, resources and financial benefit.
- b. **Role of new Technologies:** Most of the groups discussed the opportunities provided by existing or developing technologies to help improve and change the current ways of working across many aspects of the food system.
- c. **Responding to needs for more knowledge and awareness:** The need for greater knowledge on the issues being discussed emerged in many discussions. There are clear benefits from ensuring greater education for individual actors (especially those at the production end), as well as increasing the overall awareness of the interconnectedness of these issues with other aspects of the food system.
- d. **Recognizing the importance of economic analyses:** Several of the dialogue tables address the importance of understanding the economic impact around creating changes in different areas of the food system. Not only is this important to ensure that the value created by food systems is more equally distributed, but it is also a necessary aspect for convincing policy makers and private sector actors.

### II How can multi-stakeholder collaboration accelerate opportunities for transformation?

- a. Having the right people at the Dialogue table: Many of the dialogue tables acknowledged that having the right people at the table was key to ensuring that ideas and information is shared and spread and leads to systematic change.

### **III How did the dialogue journey go**

- a. By providing participants with themes to discuss, the second round of Dialogues dug deeper into the different experiences, backgrounds and perspectives of the members of each group. As in the first round, the discussion remained open and respectful allowing the various opinions and suggestions to be debated calmly.
- b. Given the short timeframe, groups unsurprisingly found it difficult to move from discussion to a specific conclusion or outcome. Despite this, the discussions yielded many strong ideas and directions that merit further exploration and provide a valuable starting point for future Dialogues.

## ANNEX 1: READOUTS FROM INDIVIDUAL DIALOGUE TABLES

<b>ROUND ONE: ORGANIZATION OF THE DIALOGUES</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Table 1</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Table 2</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Table 3</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Table 4</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Table 5</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Table 6</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Table 7</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Table 8</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>ROUND TWO: DIALOGUES ABOUT SPECIFIC ISSUES</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Table 1: Access to nutritious, sustainable and healthy diets</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Table 2: Build the economic case and incentives</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Table 3: Enable carbon neutrality and adaptation to climate</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Table 4: Galvanize innovation and technology</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Table 5: Increase efficiency and transparency across value-chains</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Table 6: Enable smallholders to increase livelihood resilience – especially women and youth</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Table 7: Restore ecosystems and promote Biodiversity</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Table 8: Understanding the contribution of Oceans</b>	<b>17</b>



## ROUND ONE: ORGANIZATION OF THE DIALOGUES

### TABLE 1

#### What was discussed

The success of the Dialogues will be partially determined by how they are facilitated. This should include addressing cultural differences, as well as giving participants the space to put inconvenient issues on the table.

It will be important to acknowledge and understand local models of discussion and decision making, and to make space for these models in the Dialogues as well as the dissemination of dialogue outcomes.

It could be more efficient and effective to build the Dialogues into existing mechanisms where possible. This would not only reduce the cost of the Dialogues, but also help to reduce overlap and ensure that the outcomes are embedded in other relevant processes.

The Dialogues could address the role of innovation to engage various stakeholders, and also to empower youth and women.

There may be opportunities in talking to local cooperatives about how to take care of the environment, especially since dealing with complexity and global actors has become the new normal for these groups even though they are based at the local level.

#### What conclusions were reached

The facilitator needs to be able to see the macro and the micro dynamics.

The right people need to be in the room. This includes large overseas landowners, youth, women, and media.

The role of trade and markets should be explored, especially the food value chain.

Existing groups and processes should be involved and connected to the dialogue process.

### TABLE 2

#### What was discussed

As the Dialogues go global, the conversations will take place with people who have more specific knowledge and, at least at first, be less 'systems' thinkers than participants at this session. It will be important for the facilitators to be able to guide people to think beyond their area of expertise.

Future Dialogues should be attended by more participants from NGOs, faith-based groups, youth, farmers, and people over 65.

The Dialogues should harness resistance and different opinions and explore the general principles among all the differences. We need to work out how to turn these differences and local complexities into an asset.

However, it could also be a space for leadership and ideas to surface without the same need for compromise that faces most governments.

Ultimately food transformation is carried by local stakeholders, so the Dialogues should explore how to raise their voices and connect their ideas, needs and concerns with policy makers and private sector actors. Connecting national policy makers with local consumers and farmers was an approach that worked well in Uganda and could be replicated within the Dialogues.

A plan is needed for how the different levels of dialogue will be tied together - from the local up to the global. It will be a challenge to create these links given how differently things operate in different markets, so this process should be thought through carefully. It needs to be clear whether the

Dialogues' purpose is to create better understanding of and commitment to global principles at all levels or identifying or creating new ways to implement change. A good coordinating mechanism will be essential to make this work.

It must be acknowledged that there are currently thousands of regulatory regimes currently in place, and these will be very difficult to change but are a crucial part of transformation.

One important approach is to make the knowledge that currently exists more available, and also to improve the way that research is done in this space. Ideally, this could be open source, but given the contextual nature of this area, it could be difficult to implement a system that works for different geographical areas.

There is a fundamental economic overlay to all these issues. The Dialogues need to explore how transformation can be achieved without requiring huge financial costs for farmers and look at ways to pay for the externalities in such a way that they can be redirected away from local producers.

#### **What conclusions were reached**

The Dialogues must centre around meaningful localism. This means that people, livelihoods and equality should be at the core.

Data should be curated and made public for more common frames of reference.

The target or outcome of Dialogues being worked towards is key. This should include identifying common solutions at different levels.

### **TABLE 3**

#### **What was discussed**

Key outcomes of the Dialogues should be awareness creation and showing participants pathways of interconnection between their perspectives and approaches. To achieve this, the Dialogues must find a way to overcome competitive positions, align different interests and recognize what different actors bring to the table.

The Dialogues should be integrated with existing Dialogues and processes at national level.

A unifying / integrated framework for the progress of the Dialogues should be developed, tested on concrete, tangible activities, and then evaluate and evolve from the outcomes.

The Dialogues could be a place to unpack the complexity and differences in how various fields and specializations communicate and helping to translate these differences among participants. This could lead to the creation of a collective set of priorities, or at least a clearer understanding of whether there is, or there could be, a common perception of the inputs and outputs of food systems.

It is important that the Dialogues involve people working on innovation and technology, and also bring consumers, particularly young consumers, to the table. This could be achieved through consumer advocates, city representatives etc.

#### **What conclusions were reached**

In order to succeed, the diversity of participants must be prioritised, including; representation of people forgotten in the discussion such as youth leaders.

It is necessary to articulate of how different levels of Dialogues will feed into each other.

There needs to be a clear stated goal or goals for the Dialogues such as: establishing a unifying framework; advancing specific solutions in places; building a systems view for specific audiences

A roadmap must be created to show when and where Dialogues happen, and how information will flow between and beyond the Dialogues.

## **TABLE 4**

### **What was discussed**

Dialogues should build a shared understanding of the problem, and the connection between micro aspects and the macro picture. It is important that locally specific solutions are identified and agreed upon within the Dialogues.

It is crucial to ensure the right people attend the Dialogues - both in terms of the range of individuals and the combination of people. Participants should be encouraged to sharing the information that they have, not just focus on extracting information and knowledge from other participants.

Each dialogue must be a safe, inclusive space where all participants can learn from each other, and connections between actors who would not usually meet and/or agree can be forged. The dialogue should lead to each participant having a sense of ownership of the concept of a global food system, while also recognising the specific role they can play as an individual and/or an organisation.

It is important for the Dialogues to lead to large and small actions, but it remains unclear whether this will happen organically or if a more structured approach is necessary.

### **What conclusions were reached**

Each dialogue should be started with: a clear understanding of what is meant by the global food system; data and analysis of the current local and global food situation; and clear goals for the outcome of the dialogue.

Dialogues must occur at global, national, regional, local levels, and the format and location of the dialogue should be tailored to the specific context. Also, stakeholder mapping is essential at each of these levels to inform who should participate in Dialogues.

Excellent curators / facilitators are essential to ensure that the dialogue not only adequately covers the local/micro, but also links it with the macro situation.

It is crucial for the overall success of the Dialogues that the knowledge and conclusions drawn from one session are adequately captured and disseminated. Creating this link between each dialogue and the overall dialogue process is key to succeeding. Creative/arts-based methods of communication should be considered.

## **TABLE 5**

### **What was discussed**

The importance of ensuring the right people are in the room. How the participants need help to become champions - what should this look like

A key goal of the Dialogues should be to increase awareness of the issues, including in some cases 'unlearning' in order to learn. How do we develop collective learning environment in the dialogue?

There are benefits to structuring Dialogues within a theme, but also important to allow for flexibility.

Time should be allocated within the Dialogues to analyse, consider and agree on the problem, and ensure that participants acknowledge that deep transformation is needed in some areas.

Business and civil society are often ahead of politicians on these issues, so the dialogue process should ensure that these different perspectives are shared. We also need to decide whether the Dialogues and the ensuing actions are meant to be provocative or not.

The Dialogues should lead to a framework for action: for people to understand the connection between land, food and health. There should be a clear pathway for this framework to be built within the Dialogues.

Fellowships and fellows' programs could be an important tool to ensure the success of the dialogue process.

#### **What conclusions were reached**

The purpose of the Dialogues needs to be clearly identified and articulated.

In each location Dialogues must be tailored for the local context - both in terms of the issues and priorities as well as the local culture.

Outcomes need to be clearly identified and shared. This could be done through art, music, theatre, or infographics.

### **TABLE 6**

#### **What was discussed**

The success of each dialogue will rely heavily on the preparation done beforehand. This should include

- Thorough review of the context, including science, indigenous and local knowledge, and history
- Careful stakeholder mapping to inform who are the participants
- Support for people who may not have the same voice/language (farmers, women etc) to prepare to participate
- Building trust and expectations by adjusting power dynamics among people who will participate

Strong facilitation during the dialogue is very important to ensure good discussion and solid outcomes. Facilitators should endeavour to guide participants to find a common understanding of the situation. This could be done by agreeing on facts and/or agreeing on what the future of the food system could or should look like.

Background information should be provided during the dialogue (especially for the initial Dialogues) to help ensure that all participants are on the same page. This should start with the local context but also include information about other contexts and the global picture.

Throughout the Dialogues, links should be drawn between the local, national, regional and global aspects of the food system.

A diversity of actors must participate, but they need to be able to participate equally.

It is crucial that the discussion and outcomes are captured and disseminated and written as well as visual means of communication should be considered. There should be a structure to ensure that learning and outcomes are built on by subsequent Dialogues - both within and across geographic areas.

Participants will need ongoing support to maintain their commitment to the dialogue outcomes. There needs to be a mechanism to offer them resources as well as a way to stay connected to other participants.

A group of fellows (ideally from the global south) could be set up to attend all Dialogues, provide support, connection and continuity between the Dialogues.

#### **What conclusions were reached**

Adequate preparation before each dialogue is essential.

Strong facilitation is crucial to not only to guide the discussion but also to create an atmosphere of trust and respect among all participants.

Building continuity and momentum between the Dialogues must be a priority in order to lead to transformational change.

## **TABLE 7**

### **What was discussed**

The Dialogues should be held at different levels - global, national, regional and landscape, and care should be taken to ensure that the right people are in the room.

One of the key outcomes of the Dialogues will be the unique connections that are created, so ensuring unconventional groups and a positive group dynamic is essential.

There should be clear rules of participation that are set to ensure honest, respectful and authentic discussion.

The Dialogues need to be seen as a process, with the challenge being how to create a 'red thread' between them that links them and builds momentum.

It will be important to have concrete goals for each dialogue and the process overall. The relationship between discussion and action needs to be further explored.

The outcomes of each dialogue should be documented, disseminated and 'branded'.

We need to think more about how we turn participants into ambassadors and influencers, since this will be important for the continuity of the dialogue process.

### **What conclusions were reached**

A diverse range of perspectives and opinions are needed to make the Dialogues successful.

Action resulting from the Dialogues should be coordinated, but include different voices delivering different messages.

Discussion and solutions should focus on the local/landscape level as this is where the issues are

## **TABLE 8**

### **What was discussed**

How is the selection process for the FSDs going to be? How many participants will attend and how will the participants be selected? Having a diversity in participants is essential to achieve meaningful progress.

Specific goals need to be set with priorities between the goals. The objective of a dialogue will need to depend on who the participants are. Which in turn will depend on continuity of the Dialogues (e.g. are the same participants going to take place in a series of Dialogues?)

What are we trying to achieve? Creating a common vision vs common purpose. Agenda setting. Agreeing on goals. Focusing on differences. Identifying key challenges.

How do you bring people in low resource setting in to these Dialogues, how to ensure representativity of the participants?

Criteria for success, vision and outcome needs to be tied together in a chain.

How does this fit with CFS and other similar processes where these discussions are taking place? The FSDs have to be complementary.

### **What conclusions were reached**

Dialogues itself motivates people/actors to action.

The output of a dialogue should not be set prior to the dialogue. It should be determined by the participants, who'll have to come to a common vision guiding the priorities.

Bringing people together, breaking silos. Technical competencies coming together and understanding each other.

Getting the smallholders involved and having youth movements involved is important. One way is to use Social Media to capture the youth voices.

Crowd-sourcing the agenda. Informal ways of sourcing input. Surveys, Social Media campaigns etc.

The Dialogues will be markedly different in the different geographies and levels.

Dialogues should be held at International, regional, national and city level. The more local, the more tangible results will be created but it will be key to ensure a mechanism to disseminate the experience between the locations and regions.

It has to be self-organizing or it'll be difficult to have 10+ Dialogues a month.

## **ROUND TWO: DIALOGUES ABOUT SPECIFIC ISSUES**

### **TABLE 1: ACCESS TO NUTRITIOUS, SUSTAINABLE AND HEALTHY DIETS**

#### **What was discussed**

Despite the impetus to reduce meat and dairy consumption, it is crucial that this discussion is had in a way that does not alienate farmers.

There must be a balanced debate about nutrition and sustainability that acknowledges the different contexts in different countries.

It will be important to explore how the Dialogues can help to shape markets.

Ultimately, pathways to making food affordable, sustainable, healthy and tasty must be found across the world.

Social media should be used to educate consumers about healthier diets.

#### **What conclusions were reached**

The role of the governments in developing policies that advance nutrition in their countries is key. However, to achieve this the discussion must be genuinely multi-stakeholder. The Dialogues could achieve this by focusing on the local context, including local health concerns.

A common agenda must be built between governments and the private sector.

### **TABLE 2: BUILD THE ECONOMIC CASE AND INCENTIVES**

#### **What was discussed**

Economics are the lever to change food systems. We are currently incentivizing the wrong outcomes. We are asking farmers to change their practices, but there are no incentives and big insecurities. Changing practices means taking a risk so it is not a rational choice given the circumstances.

Food systems are adapted to "paying for yields" vs "ecosystem services" (compare carbon credits).

It is necessary to look at specific local cases and find their connection to capital flows on the global scale.

Currently, there is reluctance to put taxes on consumption / the end products because it would not be popular.

It will be important to further assess: what approaches are already working; what are the side effects of economic policies; where are the assets; and what are the capital flows which impact global and local food systems.

**What conclusions were reached**

Economics are critical to move every part of food systems. We need to incorporate the economic factors in each of the conversations, and with the right incentives, the whole value chain will adapt.

Outcomes that the Dialogues could achieve include a greater knowledge about who the market actors are and how they can be incentivized; and stronger efforts in advocating the re-allocation of subsidies.

**TABLE 3: ENABLE CARBON NEUTRALITY AND ADAPTATION TO CLIMATE**

The group was small and diverse. One person joined by skype from Yaounde.

**What was discussed:**

Climate changing is already having a major impact on the well-being of people in vulnerable landscapes and requires urgent action with different stakeholders working much better together than now.

**What conclusions were reached**

It is important to listen to the voices of all – especially in rural areas and particularly young people and women involved in agri- and pisci-culture. Their accounts of how their lives are being affected by climate change are important.

Better narratives are needed to communicate the issues to wider public. Important to engage with media specialists who can help transfer that narrative to people who need to hear it.

Powerful efforts are needed to bring food and land use systems more into the climate-related discussions. The success of efforts on energy show what is possible: can food systems learn from how the energy sector has moved?

[The specific issue for this dialogue table was too broad for the group to emerge with specificities]

**TABLE 4: GALVANIZE INNOVATION AND TECHNOLOGY**

**What was discussed**

It is important to consider the two concepts separately. Innovation is bigger than technology and doesn't necessarily involve technological aspects. Technology introduces new costs, whereas innovation is a new form of thinking that often involves risks.

However, both concepts are cross-cutting to all the topics discussed in the tables.

There is a need for coordination and collaboration for both of them to be effective.

The role of elected government officials and investment should be addressed through the Dialogues. Also, the role that we need or want the private sector to play should be clarified.

A big question that remains is whether a scalable, technological solution for food systems can be found.

**What conclusions were reached**

Innovation and technology should be considered separately, and both topics would be more effective as cross-cutting across the Dialogues rather than stand-alone discussions.

## **TABLE 5: INCREASE EFFICIENCY AND TRANSPARENCY ACROSS VALUE-CHAINS**

### **What was discussed**

A food systems approach with in which value generation for all is set as a priority should be considered during the Dialogues.

Need to consider efficiency versus sufficiency. For example, chickens grown in rural Africa feeds urban Africa as fast food with negative health outcomes

The social aspects of value chains must be taken into account and should be considered region by region.

Current value chain models lead to the least return on investment for the farmers and producers. We need to discuss how to generate value from source for all and develop programs and approaches that benefit farmers and smallholders.

The role of educating and engaging youth should be prioritised.

Princeton is taking a global approach through teaching, research and education: both at Princeton and projects in Kenya, Mauritius, have started with local engagement. 15 students are in Mauritius on the ground to look at modernity at the local level. Research on palm oil production and implications on biodiversity is a current project.

At the national level politicians and policy makers should be educated and current and future states should be shared in a positive learning environments.

### **What conclusions were reached**

Consider developing a global food systems framework within which value chains is a major theme.

The approach taken needs to be inclusive at all stages - locally, nationally, regionally and globally.

The more that all stakeholders understand the value chains and their place in them (especially farmers and producers), the more equitable things will become.

## **TABLE 6: ENABLE SMALLHOLDERS TO INCREASE LIVELIHOOD RESILIENCE – ESPECIALLY WOMEN AND YOUTH**

### **What was discussed**

There are significant challenges to addressing this issue, including:

- Low levels of education and access to education among rural population, especially women
- Insufficient or non-existent infrastructure such as roads and internet coverage.
- Access to rights and resources such as land rights (especially for women), water, information, technology, genetic resources
- Lack of current benefits and incentives for staying or becoming a farmer, especially for young people who are drawn to the opportunities and lifestyle of urban centres
- Environmental changes including increased droughts and floods

However, there are also opportunities to improve this situation, including:

- Developing rural areas to incentivise and entice people to stay and (creating small/medium cities?)
- Doing more to recognise the crucial role of women, specifically by investing time and money in developing women's skills and supporting women to increase their access to resources
- Using technology, especially tailored to the specific needs of women and the elderly
- Ensuring farmers have access to information and resources, as well as the space to exercise their own agency in deciding their future path



### **What conclusions were reached**

Despite the extent of the problems and challenges facing smallholders, there are large opportunities within the framework of the dialogue process to identify solutions at a local and even national and regional level.

When developing solutions and approaches, it is crucial to look at the specific needs of women, youth and elderly small holders. This should be done in consultation with these groups.

## **TABLE 7: RESTORE ECOSYSTEMS AND PROMOTE BIODIVERSITY**

### **What was discussed**

Biodiversity is a concept that doesn't currently resonate. It needs to be translated into what is meaningful for the targeted audience, and food could be a meaningful entry point.

The biodiversity community should be linked into other relevant communities. For instance, there would be great benefit to bringing together the nutrition community (e.g. GAIN) and the biodiversity community to unlock how the priorities can reinforce each other and scale to a bigger change for the food system.

Greater policy coherence is needed. For instance, in Brazil food guidelines from the health ministry (eat local, diverse) are not supported or reinforced by agriculture priorities.

There needs to be a focus on identifying and sharing good examples of scaling food production without having a negative impact on biodiversity.

Country leadership should be included where they are exhibiting progressive strategies, such as France or Costa Rica.

It might be valuable to create learning journeys/field trips to enable those engaging in the Dialogues to understand the consequences of systems.

### **What conclusions were reached**

Biodiversity is very poorly understood, so the Dialogues could be an important forum of changing this and ensuring that this issue is adequately addressed.

The economics and incentives of improving biodiversity should be investigated and promoted through the Dialogues.

## **TABLE 8: UNDERSTANDING THE CONTRIBUTION OF OCEANS**

### **What was discussed**

Food supply from oceans critical for a safe, food secure future. Oceans are a big food space, but there are many unknowns. We are still understanding its potential and role in securing food for humanity to stay within planetary boundaries. The key question is how this be done sustainably.

Currently the biggest threats to oceans are climate change and overfishing.

More understanding is needed around how climate shocks will affect fisheries. For example, crop failures on land, higher sea surface temperatures, ocean acidification, more frequent and more intense natural disasters.

There is a need for greater acknowledgment of how land-based food practices lead to pollution in the ocean - it is estimated that there will be more plastic in the sea than fish by 2050.

Lack of borders is a big issue for governance, but also an exciting opportunity. The role of different actors in this sphere could be better mapped out.

The potential of aquaculture could be explored to understand what its capacity is, and how it can be expanded.

Support from big fishing companies could be thought, e.g. through the Keystone Dialogues Initiative “SeaBOS”, though there is a need to also consider small-scale fishers since two thirds of the fish we eat is caught by small-scale fishers.

**What conclusions were reached**

The Dialogues should be an excellent platform for ensuring that the intersection between what happens on land and what happen at sea intersect.

Currently a sustainable/robust supply chain from oceans does not exist. The Dialogues could be a forum to start building one.

-----

## Annex 2: Agenda

### 08:00 -08:30 **Introduction and Opening Remarks**

Opening remarks by the initiators of the Food Systems Dialogues

- How to build a common approach to implementing a food systems transformation?
- How to build on each other's capabilities to accelerate progress while aligning with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development?'

Introduction to the Food Systems Dialogues (Moderator)

### 08:40 – 09:50 **Breakout Dialogues - Round 1**

Participants will be divided into 8 groups, each with a theme related to transforming food systems.

Each dialogue will have a Facilitator to help guide the discussion and report back to the full group at the end of each round. A list of themes is proposed – participants may self-select based on availability:

Guiding questions for each Dialogue group include:

- What are the key challenges, trade-offs and opportunities?
- How to accelerate transformation through multi-stakeholder collaboration?

Each group will be asked to report back 1-2 ambitions and actions to advance food systems transformation.

### 09:50 – 10:15 **Report Back (Round 1)**

Facilitators will share ambitions and actions identified during the breakouts.

### 10.15 – 10.30 *Break*

### 10:30 – 11:40 **Breakout Discussion- Round 2**

Participants will rotate to a new theme, and facilitators will remain at their origin table.

Guiding questions for each group include:

- What are the key challenges, trade-offs and opportunities?
- How to accelerate transformation through multi-stakeholder collaboration?

Each group will be asked to report back 1-2 ambitions and actions to advance food systems transformation.

### 11:40 – 12:05 **Report Back (Round 2)**

Facilitators will share ambitions and actions identified during the breakouts.

### 12:05 – 12:15 *Break*

### 12.15 – 13:00 **Discussion and Summary**

The moderator facilitates a discussion among all participants. At the end of the session the Moderator will summarize key insights and invite participants' recommendations on the way forward.