

Contents

Fair prices: Because society will valorise the role that farmers play in food systems through real costing/pricing, rural populations, especially youth, will have improved economic and social perspectives and farmers will be better included in relevant economic and political decision making processes.	3
Strong social movements and networks between households, at national and community levels promote not only healthier nutrition and sustainable food systems, but facilitate better economic cooperation along the value and supply chains and in family/care work and thus allow equal opportunities for men and women in economic activities as well as equal political participation.	6
Sustainable Production: Because production will be more sustainable and supply chains shorter, producers and consumers will be more closely linked, food and food choices will be healthier and prices be fairer and livelihoods more decent, while food loss and waste, the use of natural resources and impacts to the environment and emissions will be minimized.	8
Conducive policies: National agriculture and food policies support sustainably produced regional and seasonal food and information on healthy and sustainable diets, thereby promoting agro-ecological management of resources and the access to and affordability of safe and nutritious food for the whole society.	10
Nutrition awareness: the systematic integration of nutrition in school curricula, maternal and infant care, etc. contributes to people's preference for a healthy diet and the production of diverse and sustainable foods, leading to improved availability and accessibility of healthy and sustainable food for all.	12
Healthy school meals: the promotion of agro-ecologically sourced meals in school & community kitchens will ensure a constant demand for agro-ecologically produced foods and healthy diets for all pupils/people of society and improve performance of students in school and people in their work.	14
Access to Land: Land and judicial reforms allow the improved and equitable access to land and justice for all, explicitly also for women and youth, thus securing all farmers' investments made on the land and the sustainable and resilient development of decent livelihoods and economic independence.	17
Fair Trade Policies: Appropriate import, export and tax regimes in countries will allow farmers to focus on products that are competitive on national, regional and international markets, allowing the creation of income and job opportunities along rural-urban supply and value chains.	21
Reliable data & certification: A national system on accurate, safe and reliable data and certification in production, distribution, processing, marketing and consumption of agricultural products will inform on the necessary elements of appropriate legal frameworks and appropriate resource use for agricultural value-chains.	24

Conducive research partnerships: International agricultural research partnerships focus on the elements of agroecology and climate resilience and take into account different regional contexts, especially also low income and/or fragile countries, and make their findings available to all.....26

Intact natural resources: By switching to locally adapted crops, soil conservation methods and sustainable irrigation systems, which use as little water as possible, (cost-) efficient food production can be maintained, while preserving water resources & aquaculture, improving soil quality, reducing soil-erosion and better adapting to adverse effects of climate change.....27



Fair prices: Because society will valorise the role that farmers play in food systems through real costing/pricing, rural populations, especially youth, will have improved economic and social perspectives and farmers will be better included in relevant economic and political decision making processes.

Round 1 Objective: For group members to collectively **reflect on the meaning of the vision statement:** What are the main ideas contained in the statement? What are the key issues to discuss more deeply in Round 2? Your task is to take summary notes. In other words, we are not looking for a long transcript, but rather key points that come out of the group discussion

1.1 What are the key elements/issues of the vision statement as identified by your group?

First of all, all participants agreed that this is a pretty dense vision statement which covers several issues. Thus, a reflection on outstanding and/or missing key elements/issues was welcomed and will certainly be in support for the drafting of the recommendations for actions needed.

In a **first open round** the following issues were identified as 'potential' key areas:

Key issues/central key elements:

- **Fair prices / costing** that leads to all the other **issues** (Costing and pricing is definitively in the value chain, an explanation what is meant by that would be helpful),
- **Improved economic and social perspective for livelihoods,**
- **Policy issues** and all - rather complex interactions between these topics.

Key stakeholders:

- **Farmers in general** and their role in input and output markets in particular,
- The **rural population**, especially youth (including urban youth),
- Focusing on **youth** (Engaging with youth is different than engaging with family farming households, thus calls for different messaging)
- **Society:** Valorising society is quite a paradigm shift of minds. It is a process but not a product.

⇒ **Interim Sum up:** Fair prices is really at the center of the statement, meaning that prices should show the hidden costs, including costs for ecosystem approach or value crated. In addition, the Vision ought to be reflected from different angles (divided into different tracks) by looking at all stakeholders of all groups and at all layers. Thus, a specific focus must be paid on the logic of connection: Does really one follow the others? E.g. does 'real' prices for food/products automatically include farmers into the decision-making process?

An example of integration of small holders in remote areas into value chains and ultimately into a market system through a whole range of activities across different sectors (ag value chain, infrastructure, communication/digitalization,) showed that we may have missed some of the key stakeholders in 'our' vision statement (e.g. traders but not limited to).

Second round of broadening-up (refining of key areas):

1. Price and costing

- Definition of fair prices, what makes up the price (not only quality), what are the mechanism and the tools of pricing, be more specific on what kind of value farmers, especially youth, will bring for the price.....
- Investment in farm management concerning the ability of farmers to manage costs (for instance, capacity building, digital tools, ...)

2. Valuing and giving the many values enough/adequate visibility

- Working through platforms or by valuing the role of farmers by the society,
- Transparency of the private sector,
- Valuing - what does it mean: e.g. does it also lead to consumer behavior change?
- What kind of value, besides local production, do small scale farmers bring, including ecosystem and social services, and how to remunerate the value add? How/what to calculate in the price of what they bring to the society.

3. Value of local production is not enough - there is a need to consider the question of **market structure (import, policies,)**. It must be supported by respective **legislation/policies, advocacy work**, and by giving the **farmers a voice**.

4. In turn, farmers need to be informed and given the space; consequently, **transparency and information flows** across the whole value chain/system ought to be strengthened. The latter requires paying enough attention to the capacities of the different organizations.

5. If we talk about 'valorizing the role of farmers', we need to look at the **role of women** in particular – a missing part in the vision statement.

6. If we talk about fair prices, we need to talk about food availability, food security (including access) as well as who pays for what, namely the affordability.

Given the above considerations the group decided to focus at least on the following four key areas for the next discussion round in May (Note: additional focus will be needed):

1. Price structure

2. **Valorization** (remuneration of the services, healthy products, locally produced, resource management, ecoservices, ...) => current and what changes are needed)

3. **Stakeholders** (Open: all actors in the value chain with a special focus on youth, women (value chain actors/supporters/enablers, consumers from public, private including finance institutions/investors, academia, state/gov, to farmers org versus some selected ones)

4. **Related policy issues:** Market inefficiency (Market structure), infrastructure, import,

1.2 What are the main areas of divergence amongst group members?

Identification of key stakeholders – keeping it broad or focusing on a few specific groups (relates to point 3 above)

1.3 What are the open questions identified by the group (if any)?

None, a challenge was to focus (to stay in the limits of the vision statement) and to avoid overlaps with other vision statement.....

1.4 Do you have any additional comments from Round 1?

The application of 'miro or mural' or any similar on-line planning tool would have greatly helped to guide the group through the process – can it be considered for the next round?



Strong social movements and networks between households, at national and community levels promote not only healthier nutrition and sustainable food systems, but facilitate better economic cooperation along the value and supply chains and in family/care work and thus allow equal opportunities for men and women in economic activities as well as equal political participation.

Round 1 Objective: For group members to collectively **reflect on the meaning of the vision statement:** What are the main ideas contained in the statement? What are the key issues to discuss more deeply in Round 2? Your task is to take summary notes. In other words, we are not looking for a long transcript, but rather key points that come out of the group discussion

1.2 What are the key elements/issues of the vision statement as identified by your group?

There is a divide between consumers and farmers. The future agriculture policies and dialogues are not integrated, farmers appear to be alienated in the face of retail growth. It is becoming difficult to learn from farmers.

This divide that farmers are marginalized and do not have the right support in the developing countries. The space for transparency is getting limited, there is a need to build capacity of farmers' networks.

Governance is the key to achieve accountability and to enhance technology and information dissemination. Women and youth should be engaged to play a role in income generation and benefit sharing among farmers.

1.2 What are the main areas of divergence amongst group members?

Should the wording be movements or networks? There was some divergence on interpretation of "movement" with part of the members feeling that the word movement has negative connotations, based on country contexts. In the end it was felt that the movement is still a good term when you consider examples of young farmer movements or technology movements. Similarly, there were some sentiments that movements are not sufficient to bring expected outcomes.

1.3 What are the open questions identified by the group (if any)?

There are strong cultural/social networks that do not translate into economic networks in many developing countries. How do we achieve this?

Market access remains a challenge, so does value addition. How can these be handled within networks?

Other key questions include:

- What do consumers want, what are their aspirations?
- What does the movement offer?

- How do we achieve these “strong networks”, using what processes?

1.4 Do you have any additional comments from Round 1?

On the title, suggestions were: whether equal opportunities could be replaced by equitable opportunities, or by equal access in economic and political participation

Summary of issues that need some deeper diving:

- Appropriate technologies and associated costs
- The gap between consumers and farmers
- Networks and their role in learning
- Value added/short value chains- what is better for smallholder farmers
- Counterbalancing pandemic effects on trade
- Technology use and how open it is
- How to best support social networks- what role is there for extension support?
- Role of context in the dynamics of social networks



Sustainable Production: Because production will be more sustainable and supply chains shorter, producers and consumers will be more closely linked, food and food choices will be healthier and prices be fairer and livelihoods more decent, while food loss and waste, the use of natural resources and impacts to the environment and emissions will be minimized.

Round 1 Objective: For group members to collectively **reflect on the meaning of the vision statement:** What are the main ideas contained in the statement? What are the key issues to discuss more deeply in Round 2? Your task is to take summary notes. In other words, we are not looking for a long transcript, but rather key points that come out of the group discussion

1.3 What are the key elements/issues of the vision statement as identified by your group?

Nexus of different stakeholder needs and elements within the statement

- Will we be able to secure the livelihood of millions of farmers, meet the demand of the consumers for cheap food and protect the environment and minimise our climate impact at the same time?
- Many elements in the statement, sustainable production, shorter chains, healthy diet, post-harvest losses and waste, emissions
- What is in it for the governments (North and South) what's in it for the private sector?
- We are missing the role of the different stakeholders, farmers, government, research, education system, civil society and private sector
- What are the causal relationships between the different stakeholders and different parts of the vision statement?

Knowledge transfer and behaviour change

- Sustainable counts for the whole world - how do we transfer knowledge to the millions of farmers - how is it translated to local level
- Knowledge and knowledge transfer linked to product and services
- Farm to fork issues - marketing will solve some of the problem
- Behavioural change how do we get consumers to buy more sustainable

Relative impact of local production on climate

- The local production is not so important, climate impact of transport is often lower than emission of production especially in livestock production
- Many inbuilt contradictions: local food chains might be good for environment and climate but bad for farmers livelihood (lower prices)

Production and supply chain

- Production will be more sustainable (need to be unpacked)
- Supply chain is critical, most people in the arid and semi-arid systems depend on livestock.
- Supply chain and choice in diet influence on the supply change
- Looking at food systems we link the dilemma between consumption and production, that is an important change in focus from the traditional production focus

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Covid-19 has disrupted many value chains
1.4 What are the main areas of divergence amongst group members?
-
1.3 What are the open questions identified by the group (if any)?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who will do this and how will they do this • Link between consumers and producers (not the other way around) – a “pull effect” • Incentives for changes • Not an either or, but the interplay • Enabling environment, especially at the policy level, is very important for facilitating change and developing a policy framework • Policy enforcement is in many countries a big challenge, the institutional capacity is not in place, often neither is the political will • Education system is an important stakeholder in behaviour change • Incentives are often very complex when looking at it in a systems-oriented way • Much more focus needed on adaptive measures, rather than mitigation • Action research more geared towards change, how can financing of research look more on impact of research • No sustainability without poverty alleviation, poverty is the main cause of environmental degradation • Ideal farming for the climate and environment might not be ideal for profitability and resilience • Fair Trade means higher consumer prices will never go to scale • Access to finance remains a major bottleneck for developing smallholder farming • Access to land and rights over land are crucial for farmers ability to be empowered • Is there a digital revolution potential in agriculture? ERP, linking to service providers, retailers, advisory services etc. • Should be private sector driven • Closer linking producers to market is happening under covid-19 • Electricity is a major problem as it is highly centralised and therefore a political interest area, like telecommunication used to be • digital platforms are used also for the food waste reduction linking consumers and producers shortening the chain, this was successfully used during covid-19 • ICT / digital platforms should be a crosscutting issue in the FS across the value chain • illiteracy is still a major challenge especially in Africa, radio still plays a major role in dissemination. Here ICT has its limitations • Important to mobilise the youth to be innovative in farming • In Italy young people are again attracted to agriculture
1.4 Do you have any additional comments from Round 1?
-



Conductive policies: National agriculture and food policies support sustainably produced regional and seasonal food and information on healthy and sustainable diets, thereby promoting agro-ecological management of resources and the access to and affordability of safe and nutritious food for the whole society.

Round 1 Objective: For group members to collectively **reflect on the meaning of the vision statement:** What are the main ideas contained in the statement? What are the key issues to discuss more deeply in Round 2? Your task is to take summary notes. In other words, we are not looking for a long transcript, but rather key points that come out of the group discussion

1.5 What are the key elements/issues of the vision statement as identified by your group?

- Regionality (multi-country) not just sub-regions of a country (other key words related: trade, net import/export, mutual dependency, need for regional policy);
- Include education and awareness raising in food system change (so far focus on production side, struggle to include transformation and consumption)
- Agro-ecology and other innovative and alternative approaches (agro-ecology considered to be too generic and often too controversial; fair and equitable is missing (?)).
- a system view is required (food must also consider fodder production and livestock)
- Social dimension of the topic is unclear;
- Local knowledge, wisdom and culture;
- Mutual dependency;
- Behavioral change;
- Policy is not understood by the farmers;
- Policy and external cost: Policy should strive provide mechanisms (incentives) for stakeholders to include external costs
- National level support required to execute policy;
- Agro-ecology is not the only solution;
- No proper direction to follow the policy pointers;
- In some countries it might work, however, overall, it seems difficult to follow properly;
- Incentives and credibility of information is unclear;
- Nutritious food is expensive;

- Relevance of policy to diet.

1.2 What are the main areas of divergence amongst group members?

- Innovative approaches;
- Agro-ecology lacks concrete definition;
- Consumption issues;
- Price hikes;
- Habits;
- Losing agriculture areas;
- Convenience;
- Localization of food.

1.3 What are the open questions identified by the group (if any)?

- Affordability of food;
- Experience sharing;
- Curriculum

1.4 Do you have any additional comments from Round 1?

In the group's view, national level policies may be either missing or outdated, and policy should be seen as a living document. While in some cases policy exists, proper execution could be an issue.

Circular agriculture could be considered as an alternative approach to agro-ecology.



Nutrition awareness: the systematic integration of nutrition in school curricula, maternal and infant care, etc. contributes to people's preference for a healthy diet and the production of diverse and sustainable foods, leading to improved availability and accessibility of healthy and sustainable food for all.

Round 1 Objective: For group members to collectively **reflect on the meaning of the vision statement:** What are the main ideas contained in the statement? What are the key issues to discuss more deeply in Round 2? Your task is to take summary notes. In other words, we are not looking for a long transcript, but rather key points that come out of the group discussion

1.6 What are the key elements/issues of the vision statement as identified by your group?

Nutrition awareness is an important topic, but often neglected in agricultural training / extension services, e.g. capacity building on how to link nutrition and production and Rural advisory services

Nutrition awareness should not be restricted to schools, mother & infant care. It requires involving **policymakers**, and the **entire value chain** with a special focus on:

- Supply-side: too much unhealthy food entering the market
- Private sector: from small to large actors

*Important to note that there is not enough data on value chain section between producers and consumers

At which **scale** should nutrition awareness-related measures be taken?

- Topic not sufficiently integrated into the **global discourse**
- Raising awareness amongst national policymakers is ineffective
- Targeting local government / local decision-making entities is key
- Pressure to raise awareness (or pressure) amongst decision-makers should come from the ground-up (constituents / consumers) -> hence importance to raise **public nutrition awareness**

Importance of **context-specific strategies** to raise awareness, i.e. adapted to **specific target groups** and their context

Raising awareness / knowledge around nutrition does not automatically lead to behaviour change.

Potential levers for action:

- Traditional knowledge and traditional food-related practices
- Use of local champions
- Coordinated collective action from the consumers

Other drivers in food-related decision making, whether conscious or unconscious, include:

- Affordability: high price of nutritious foods, trade-off between cash-crops and own consumption
- Availability: market access
- Production / yield
- Technology
- Social norms, culture, beliefs, habits

Indicators to evaluate whether the vision has been achieved:

- Micro-nutrient deficiencies in the population // stunting – absolute numbers/share of population
- Diversification of agricultural production
- Quality (diversification) of school meals
- Increased demand / organized action: harmonized message related to nutritious foods from multiple stakeholders
- Level of stakeholder engagement (e.g. via social media)

1.2 What are the main areas of divergence amongst group members?

n/a

1.3 What are the open questions identified by the group (if any)?

How to move from raising awareness to behaviour change?

How to stimulate coordinated and collective actions from the demand-side to push for a shift in production / in the supply-side towards healthier foods?

===

A discussion took place on introducing changes to the vision statement. Whether to change the vision statement or not was not decided in the group.

Possible changes to the vision statement discussed:

- Replace “systemic integration” with “mainstreaming”
- “Leveraging trainings to Small holder farmers, school curricula, health counselling, retail procurement and promotion strategies, to influence directly or indirectly people’s preference towards a healthy diet and motivate farmers to produce more diverse and sustainable foods, leading to improved availability and accessibility of healthy and sustainable food for all.”

1.4 Do you have any additional comments from Round 1?

n/a



Healthy school meals: the promotion of agro-ecologically sourced meals in school & community kitchens will ensure a constant demand for agro-ecologically produced foods and healthy diets for all pupils/people of society and improve performance of students in school and people in their work.

Round 1 Objective: For group members to collectively **reflect on the meaning of the vision statement:** What are the main ideas contained in the statement? What are the key issues to discuss more deeply in Round 2? Your task is to take summary notes. In other words, we are not looking for a long transcript, but rather key points that come out of the group discussion

1.7 What are the key elements/issues of the vision statement as identified by your group?

Awareness:

- Must be included as a core element of *promotion*. This includes awareness related to human health, as well as planetary health – the holistic value of agroecologically produced food must be emphasized.
- Strong role for integration of the vision statement with Vision 5 (nutrition awareness), but we should also remember that awareness requires practice. Awareness-raising actions should not just be limited to knowledge but also to practice. E.g., planting vegetable gardens and cooking (not just theoretical teaching).
- In urban areas especially, need for innovative ways to forge much stronger links between schools and rural environments.

Defining Agroecological & Healthy:

- How to capture the spirit of agroecology without getting too dogmatic and restrictive so that it can be flexibly adapted to local contexts and needs?
One suggestion was to focus on soil health.
- In certain places, not all food needs can be met through local agro-ecologically (AE)-produced food. There is still a role for centrally procured foods which have either been imported or come from other regions. Therefore, we need to include national policymakers.
- Agroecologically-produced food is not necessarily healthy food. Vision statement misses this important point, so requires elaboration in linking the two together.
- A common understanding of healthy is required, but in a way that allows flexibility to adapt to local context, seasons, agro-ecological zones, needs, tastes, habits and culture. E.g., pesticide-free, diverse, locally-produced. Further, the nutrient content of meals should be linked to the requirements of different age groups. Obesity rates should also be considered. E.g., target specific micronutrient deficiencies informed by specific micronutrient surveys. This could then be used to inform the use of bio-fortified foods which are successful but challenging to commercialize.
- Diversity as a key element of healthy is missing and should be included.

Participation & Governance:

- Who is creating the demand? Pupils, local communities, farmer coops, schools, parents, local authorities via e.g., procurement regulations / favoured sourcing criteria?
- In Zambia, local committees are formed to facilitate the participation of all stakeholders in the process. The committees include community representatives, farmers, school boards etc. and are in charge of facilitating the connection between farmers as potential suppliers and schools as buyers. This is a good practice example.
- A much wider range of stakeholders need to be included in the process than is currently the case. This includes farmers around schools, community health workers, extension officers, local leaders and government authorities, teachers, pupils, nutrition experts, local transporters, input suppliers, aggregators especially as most individual farmers cannot meet the quantity requirements of schools on a constant and reliable basis. Connections with finance suppliers are especially important as often farmers do not have sufficient working capital.

Education:

Several needs for more education were identified that are often overlooked:

- Mainstreaming nutrition education into school curricula
- Educating farmers on good agricultural practices esp. in the areas of storage and safety so that the health benefits of foods are maximized
- Providing education on how to prepare and cook healthy meals (cooks, parents, youth). Often assumed people know how to cook healthy dishes if the produce is healthy, but not the case.

Costs of Transitioning:

- Need to recognize that there are costs involved in transitioning from conventionally-produced to AE-produced foods. Time is also a factor. A pragmatic approach would be to view this transition as a spectrum of incremental steps, rather than an overnight revolution. This implies building systems and processes that allow for flexibility and can be improved over time.
- It could be interesting to explore the concept of true cost accounting to build support for funding the transition to AE-produced foods.

1.2 What are the main areas of divergence amongst group members?

Role of Awareness: On the one hand awareness is important, as stated above. However, awareness does not necessarily lead to people making the right food choices. The focus on school meals therefore could provide an “easy” entry point for integrating agroecologically-produced food into local systems because there is no “choice” as such. For example, procurement regulations that favour agroecologically produced food could be effective even without large investments in awareness-raising. This raises the question of how sustainable such initiatives can be. If citizens have low awareness, they are less likely to “enforce” procurement rules – this in turns opens up avenues for the system to be abused. There is also evidence that students themselves can be a valuable force in generating demand – student movements can be very effective in influencing what is served to them. They are also powerful voices in their families and communities. Social media can be useful in leveraging this voice.

1.3 What are the open questions identified by the group (if any)?

- How to define agroecologically produced, whether food can be agroecologically-sourced (is this a well-understood term?)
- How to approach the concept and definition of healthy?
- How to integrate diversity into the vision statement?
- How to deal with responsibility and budget shifting issues that may arise when it comes to integrating government institutions especially aligning the roles of Ministry of Education and Ministry of Health? Who and how should be engaged to bring them together?

1.4 Do you have any additional comments from Round 1?

Gender as a critical pathway for enabling transition to AE produced food in schools and communities, as well as for building awareness and community action.



Access to Land: Land and judicial reforms allow the improved and equitable access to land and justice for all, explicitly also for women and youth, thus securing all farmers' investments made on the land and the sustainable and resilient development of decent livelihoods and economic independence.

Round 1 Objective: For group members to collectively **reflect on the meaning of the vision statement:** What are the main ideas contained in the statement? What are the key issues to discuss more deeply in Round 2? Your task is to take summary notes. In other words, we are not looking for a long transcript, but rather key points that come out of the group discussion

1.8 What are the key elements/issues of the vision statement as identified by your group?

- Just land use and governance will be key for issues around sustainable development, many smallholder farmers face challenge to access land. Only through remarkable land reform we will have sustainable food system
- Questions around the use of communal land and allocation to individual users; community forestry; customary land tenure, land rights and governance.
- Access to land and land use, conflicting between refugee camps and landowners. How to apply notion of **just** access.
- Aspect of social inclusion, equitable access to land and justice. In most westernized systems, land tenure rights are explicit and can be handed down, but in many male-dominated systems, women's rights recognition is limited. Women empowerment and sensitization around land inheritance rights needed.
- Decent livelihood: decent is a value-laden term – people have different ways of understanding it. Is there a threshold to be “decent”? The definition of the term is dependent on the value systems. What's SDC's definition?
- Missing part: rural land? Especially in the world of development practitioners, we think of rural. Land systems governance has to consider both rural and urban. Both parts are to be integrated.
- Metrics/ measurement: how important is it to assess new schemes of indicators when we come with new solutions? That means that we must value assets which currently aren't valorized (like research for example).
- Nowadays, many national policies in Sub-Saharan Africa consider smallholder farming as being inefficient, unproductive and unable to cope with food demand at societal, national and global levels. Alternatively consider profit motivated corporate agriculture as a solution which is very unsustainable in terms of energy demand, social stability and ecological resilience. Sustainable food systems cannot be achieved through unsustainable production system and the topic of land capture by big companies must be raised.
- Contradictory point: 1) improve equitable access to land but 2) secure all farmers that have access the land. Public land being given to land users (ag or forest) with a 10 years lease for example, the duration encourages investments made and would justify that that the

same land is given to the same user, but this prevents the equitable access to all. We should give a timeframe. People who invested for 10 years in the land want to keep them, so after the lease they can continue using it. At the same time, this prevents equitable access because technically equitable would mean an open competition, everyone should be able to access it. Contradiction not addressed in the statement.

- Duration of lease or sharecropping agreement matter: land in economic land concession models (such as Bulgaria using land leases) promotes short term vision and farming systems that have intensive inputs. We are encouraged to see more landscape-based agricultural models that allow for small holders to use home gardens and agroforestry systems that are more in line with the global movement for regenerative agriculture. But this takes a longer-term perspective and devolution of decision making to subnational approaches that allows for smallholders to get legal access to land. Temporal component is key, since short term vision will negatively influence smallholder cropping, move towards annual systems, not intercropping with trees because won't be able to harvest the trees in the long term. Tenure security - how long is long enough?
- Energy demand and social structure for community agriculture. Important to discourage monocropping and promote biodiversity.
- Food security, poverty alleviation: key to shift away from smallholder farming systems and go to economic land concessions. Could this be a solution or not? Large land leases to large companies while driving community groups off the land are not sustainable. Vast majority of the world is under smallholder regime, how do we ensure reforms don't ruin them against corporate agriculture systems (ex. China).
- Statement's focus is on smallholders, but a vision of food systems should be broader. If we only focus on the smallholders, what would it mean for big ones in terms of securing longer term sustainability of food systems? This comment goes for all statements and we need to take a broader look to target food systems. Corporate companies: how should they be engaged to have an overall systems vision? What should be the balance for the vision to include big companies and smallholders/ what are the trade-offs and the balance? Big ones make a lot of investment for the lands, but is it a reason to allow them to continue using communal land? Not really...
- We're in the midst of the issue, what we are confronted with is the complexity of the systems as such. On the one hand we examine the smallholder farmers that produce most of the food of the world, but the big ones must also be addressed as they pressure the system. Micro, meso and macro - how do we bring them all together?
- If we try to understand this as the system, we must consider how to look at landscape systems with multiple claims (culture, carbon emission etc). This is about more than food.
- Various sectors get together and embrace the complexity of the system. We can start negotiating the use of the land and that is important, but it has to be combined with what is produced and how it is produced.
- For whom food systems should be fairer and just? We don't have to avoid actors that have their say. Vision should emphasize much more, to embrace the complexity of a system and it's easier to start with the local levels, and how the global perspective influences the local systems. We should address these trade-offs and transform them into opportunities. We should not forget the macro level, understand how the macro plays in the meso level. And then if we show the good generated through managing the meso level in a

sustainable manner, we have to start valorizing the assets brought in different ways into the food systems. This way we can create new opportunities for investments.

- Bring in research and analysis
- How do we bring big guys into the game? They are investors and we contribute with our pensions and they have a long-term vision, which is interesting. Strengthen smallholder rights, but find a balance with larger interests that have a role to play in the future. How to find the right entry points? The balance between smallholder farmer and corporate agriculture rests upon well-established instruments of checks and balances at international and national levels i.e. policies and legislations to make responsible and accountable investments in agriculture. We bear in mind that we talk of unequal parties in terms of political influence and financial muscle.
- 2 other issues according to land access, not necessarily to be in the vision but to keep in mind. Level of the problem: land abandonment in marginal areas, areas that aren't so good for modern agriculture, and land conversion to non-agricultural fields, enlarging big cities to address social issues (rural to urban displacement, migration, etc., tourism development). Most of these uses take up agricultural land.
- Land systems are not just about food, but a whole wide variety of products and services. Landscape approaches are trying to address these integrated systems (and trade-offs) at a more manageable scale. The landscape still has different scales and issues, but we can easily deal with the power dynamics of local through this geographical level (landscape). Macro-level definitely plays an important role for setting prices, international trade and commerce, and the investors that they report to. Land access and land governance are both related to power dynamics. And smallholders have little ability to fight for their customary rights. That is why SDC is focused on the smallholder systems. The vision statement needs to be clear on what it is trying to achieve. Equitable and decent are value-ridden terms that SDC should probably clarify before moving to the Action Plan.
- Growing question of water tenure, and the need to protect and secure access to water, in a same fashion as protecting access to land. It is linked to human rights to sanitation and may concern other actors as well.
- Commercial agriculture has a role to play and the "how" to engage actors in this field varies. At the same time, we need to consider how to secure all farmers' investments made on the land.

1.2 What are the main areas of divergence amongst group members?

No major divergence of opinions.

- The only divergence was on the importance of the land abandonment issue, which is more of an issue in specific regions (Bulgaria) and is less globally (less Asia, less Africa). Lands aren't used for production in some places because they aren't fertile anymore. The specific issues were divergent but the need to regenerate unused lands was commonly raised among group members.
- not really included by SDC in this vision but should be included – not only access to land but access to food production-related resources that must be sustainable.

- Not really divergences but questions raised around the right to plant what you want on the land you have access to. Controlling of who grows what depends on political contexts, but also links to the discussion around agroecology, feeding the population better, being more local in supply chains, what does it mean for the use of the land we have?

1.3 What are the open questions identified by the group (if any)?

- Not only land, but also access to resources including lakes, water, fisheries, etc. Should we include this in the statement? What about access to the resource needed to produce food. Would the group agree that the problem is larger than access to land, and should include more broadly access to resources (water, lake/fisheries sites) to produce food and generate livelihoods? Or do you have divergent point of view?
- How to address land abandonment, companies forcing farmers to leave their land, making big promises that aren't usually followed. Big topic in China– rent the land from the farmers, from small pieces of land to big pieces of land to get profit. In terms of aggregation of land and takeover by big companies - sometimes farmers can continue to produce on this land, but it is not clear if they have a choice of crops and what income they will receive.
- We need to consider ecosystem of goods and services, not only think about food systems, but include carbon, climate change mitigation, water use. Landscape approaches is a way to have micro scale lens, but also to look at multisectoral dimensions at a geographic scale that is tangible. Macro level players can be identified (Nestlé, Unilever) as they play an important role in prices, income schemes, in setting schemes, e-commerce and international trade.
- As we look at power dynamics, how to mitigate these various levels? The local level is where the judicial system happens, so how to secure land access to the small farmers but also include international trade and companies around the table?
- Clarify what equitable and decent mean before going to actions plans.

1.4 Do you have any additional comments from Round 1?

Is access to land for everyone that is equitable the goal?

Within the UNFSS framework, member states should think about instruments to protect family farming and smallholder farmers from the takeover by companies, but also from lack of choice around what is produced. What happens at different levels must be considered, if climate policies ask for production of biofuel through palm oil, it creates so much incentives that corrupt the entire system. Influence of companies, but also policies is to be considered.



Fair Trade Policies: Appropriate import, export and tax regimes in countries will allow farmers to focus on products that are competitive on national, regional, and international markets, allowing the creation of income and job opportunities along rural-urban supply and value chains.

Round 1 Objective: For group members to collectively **reflect on the meaning of the vision statement:** What are the main ideas contained in the statement? What are the key issues to discuss more deeply in Round 2? Your task is to take summary notes. In other words, we are not looking for a long transcript, but rather key points that come out of the group discussion

1.9 What are the key elements/issues of the vision statement as identified by your group?

Definition of trade: it is very difficult to agree on a definition of trade and there were a lot of questions and clarifications about the vision statement.

- The concept of **fair trade** seems to be too narrow since free trade and fair trade can coexist.
- There is also a dilemma between fair trade and protectionism. It was discussed whether fair trade requires a bit of protectionism, and if yes, what are the available tools?
- Is the vision statement about **trade** in general? And why is it “fair trade policies” instead of just “trade policies”? (**free vs fair vs “trade policies”**)
- And what does **fairness** mean? Agree on it, also on a realistic action across it. Let’s stay focused, be inclusive and the vision statement will become clear.
- We have to think beyond **fair trade certification** and talk more about **sustainable trade**.
- Having a clear definition of trade is very important for those who **facilitate trade:** facilitation is an important concept in the vision statement, which shows the essence of the discussion: it’s important to build capacity of tariff and non-tariff barriers. **Solution:** equitable and sustainable trade and tax regimes.
- What is missing: which **products** are the focus of the vision statement? **Livelihood and economic concepts** are not included in the statement

Balance between national and local: Why does the vision statement include **national markets** although we are talking a lot about **international trade**? We should have a **clear focus** and thus concentrate on **transboundary trade:** it might help not to include **National** because it speaks to **domestic trade** while the issues are **more export related**

- Why are we even talking about **import and export** and not just **appropriate trade**? And what does **appropriate** actually mean? Appropriate from which perspective (government, civil society, farmers etc.)?

Solution-approaches:

Include transit: since for example in West Africa transit is very important, try to create value-chains there to make products more **competitive** (f.e. fish)

Capacity building along market systems: where trade is involved, build capacity for border staff so they know which **laws** exist and understand them

- To have an impact on the bottom-line of the traders, we have to create information: what do we need to do for farmers to be well informed?

From producers to consumers: Not only engage the farmers, but also the consumers by ensuring there are **incentives** along the value-chains

Gender-Mainstreaming: it is important to have **more women and young people** being involved and there should be an **inclusion of Gender** in trade:

- How do we ensure that young people and women are included? Gender element is often missing and we lack data because most women traders are informal. Therefore, we have to make sure more women have access to **financial support, information and applicable actions (Advocacy)**

Rural-urban incentives: how to stop the **urban migration**? By ensuring that young people can stay on the farm and it is still **beneficial** to work there

- Creation of income and job that should be equitable and sustainable and that can be called “**decent jobs**”! Plus: **Fair prices** are very important.

Role of policies: they have to be **appropriate** for the home country and markets, and need to ensure that trade is **fair**

- Political will of the government is important to **implement the policies**, which should take into consideration **types of products, prices, quality** etc.

1.10 What are the main areas of divergence amongst group members?

-

1.3 What are the open questions identified by the group (if any)?

Digitalization and Technology: who will be **responsible** for the digitalization of trade and pay for it?

1.4 Do you have any additional comments from Round 1?

-



Reliable data & certification: A national system on accurate, safe and reliable data and certification in production, distribution, processing, marketing and consumption of agricultural products will inform on the necessary elements of appropriate legal frameworks and appropriate resource use for agricultural value-chains.

Round 1 Objective: For group members to collectively **reflect on the meaning of the vision statement:** What are the main ideas contained in the statement? What are the key issues to discuss more deeply in Round 2? Your task is to take summary notes. In other words, we are not looking for a long transcript, but rather key points that come out of the group discussion

1.11 What are the key elements/issues of the vision statement as identified by your group?

- Emphasis is on data. This is understood to be about:
 - Increasing access to data
 - Data informed actions and decisions
 - Data sharing and collaboration
 - It is about relevant stakeholders collaborating to generate data (not just scientific data or scientist generating data)
 - Establishing national networks for food and nutrition security data collection
- Appropriate legal frameworks and appropriate resource use – depends on what is to be achieved
- Appropriate legal framework vs enabling environment and endowed resource allocation.

1.2 What are the main areas of divergence amongst group members?

n/a

1.3 What are the open questions identified by the group (if any)?

- Does the vision include livestock? If it does, maybe the phrase “including livestock” should be part of the vision statement.
- Are supply chains considered as part of value chains in the vision statement?
- What kind of certification?
 - What is the change we want?
 - Certification can be a barrier to achieving the vision. Clarity needed.
- Where does local knowledge fit in all this?
 - Need for dialogue and bottom-up approach where local knowledge sources are valued.

- National systems should embed indigenous knowledge systems.
- What is the goal of the system?
 - Context matters.
 - Vision statement does not stand alone. What are the intended outcomes and impact to support?
- Who is providing data? Who has access to the data?
 - How to include private sector in a win-win setup?
 - Data proprietary issues? Who owns the data and decides how it used?
 - How do you protect those providing data?
 - How do you stop data abuse?
- What is the need?
 - What data is needed?
 - What kind of data?
 - Are we certifying data or using data to certify?
 - Clarity on what safe data is. Is this secure national data system?
- Need for systems to have clear boundaries.
 - Who are the relevant participants and key actors?
 - Role of the Ministries of Agriculture – in some countries MoA may claim to already have a system in place. Is this about strengthening and supporting such systems or developing new ones?
 - National Bureau of statistics – what is their role?
 - Who else must participate to produce accurate, safe, reliable data?
 - Ensuring broad participation at the same time being mindful of the challenges and complexities associates with broad participation – it is about trade-offs.
- Does appropriate resource include both natural and financial resources?

1.4 Do you have any additional comments from Round 1?



NOTES DISCUSSION GROUP – CONDUCTIVE RESEARCH PARTNERSHIPS

Conductive research partnerships: International agricultural research partnerships focus on the elements of agroecology and climate resilience and take into account different regional contexts, especially also low income and/or fragile countries, and make their findings available to all.

Round 1 Objective: For group members to collectively **reflect on the meaning of the vision statement:** What are the main ideas contained in the statement? What are the key issues to discuss more deeply in Round 2? Your task is to take summary notes. In other words, we are not looking for a long transcript, but rather key points that come out of the group discussion

1.12 What are the key elements/issues of the vision statement as identified by your group?

1. The group suggested that it would be better to characterize the types of international research partnerships: The partnerships should be **highly inclusive and participatory/collaborative** with national research organizations and stakeholders
2. The international research partnership should enhance national and local ownership of the research process and products through genuine collaboration with national research, development partners including private sector and policy makers, producers' organizations
3. The research processes should incorporate the research product dissemination plans from the beginning of research.
4. **Readjustment of the statement:** The research partnership should not only focus on issues of **agro-ecologies** and climate resilience -- but rather embrace the concept of **food systems as whole. Therefore, the adjusted title of the statement should read: International research partnerships focus on elements of food systems and take into account different regional contexts, especially also low income and/or fragile countries, and make findings available and facilitate their use by all.**

1.2 What are the main areas of divergence amongst group members?

No divergence- members were in agreement

1.3 What are the open questions identified by the group (if any)?

- (1) How to establish an inclusive and truly collaborative research partnerships between international and national research organizations? good examples were shared but it will be good to document them
- (2) Inclusive and participatory research is time and financial resources consuming? are the donors ready to support the cost and lengthy process?
- (3) How to design demand led research?
- (4) How to integrate accountability in delivering the targeted results including research products?

1.4 Do you have any additional comments from Round 1?

The inclusive and collaborative research partnerships enhance the uptake of research products uptake

The research partnership should take into consideration the risks and their implications e.g. COVID-19

The research should integrate strategies for dissemination of research products



Intact natural resources: By switching to locally adapted crops, soil conservation methods and sustainable irrigation systems, which use as little water as possible, (cost-) efficient food production can be maintained, while preserving water resources & aquaculture, improving soil quality, reducing soil-erosion and better adapting to adverse effects of climate change.

Facilitator: -, Janny Vos stepped in to get the group going, with help from Chandra

Note taker: Janny Vos initially, Ueli stepped in to help with note taking

Group members: Chandra Silori , Teak Seng (Cambodia), Isabella Pagotto, Alisher Shabdol (SDC), Phaniel, Berhanu Ertiro, Teak Seng

Notes Chatham house style

Round 1 Objective: For group members to collectively **reflect on the meaning of the vision statement:** What are the main ideas contained in the statement? What are the key issues to discuss more deeply in Round 2? Your task is to take summary notes. In other words, we are not looking for a long transcript, but rather key points that come out of the group discussion

1.13 What are the key elements/issues of the vision statement as identified by your group?

Keeping natural resources intact is key to the vision statement. There is little time left to feed the population, we need about 50% more food production. One size won't fit all, local context is critical. We first need to look at the local scale and circumstances and then think of the bigger picture, map out circumstance to inform policy to make the bigger picture decisions. By switching to **locally adapted crops, soil conservation methods and sustainable irrigation systems**, which use as little water as possible, (cost-) efficient food production can be maintained, while preserving water resources & aquaculture, improving soil quality, reducing soil-erosion and better adapting to adverse effects of climate change. How can we ensure that the needs and the understanding of what needs to be implemented and the policies are in perfect harmony to ensure that the vision statement may become a reality. Bold **political change** would be that sustainably produced food that is not extracting from the local natural resources should be available to consumers (**incentive mechanisms** should work in the right sense in order to bring about the behavioural change we need).

What should be the balance between different demands and markets for food, feed, fiber, fuel (energy) whilst also making sure that there is food security and reduced poverty? We should identify what is the competition on land use, e.g. bio-energy demands: should we not focus on crop production instead of bio-energy? Need policy on land use too, so we can conserve natural resources. This is critical, have the political will to change things but ensure we work in partnership with local communities whilst maintaining leadership to get to the vision over time. We need better land-use policy (in Ethiopia people have the right to produce everywhere, even on the top of mountains). Encourage governments to have strong policies on land use and land use functions on different surfaces. Land encroachment free of charge needs to be avoided on local, regional and national level. Generally, **policies are set too top down**, should be more in touch with communities. Developing policies in partnership with communities that are supposed to benefit from / deal with the policies. Plus, how policies are translated into implementation. How

to translate knowledge of research into practice. Communication issues between different stakeholder groups needs to be tackled much better, much more resources needed to be invested in that. Campaign approach?

We should move away from extractive methods in food production, we have always used extractive methods in agriculture as we felt we could restore afterwards but we should turn this around, first restore soil health / agro-ecosystem before we grow crops that extract from the soil / ecosystem. Focus on use of natural resources whilst preserving: if we look at 2050, we need more and better-quality food but also we need more water. How do we ensure that the land, energy, water nexus is considered. Integrated planning. Conservation also of the natural environment in the pastoral areas and pastoral production system. The current food production is very nature-negative – how do we move from nature negative to nature positive. We need to restore the function of degraded agro-eco systems.

There should be a shift to healthier food, e.g. move away from meat-focused diets towards more healthy and diverse diets could potentially help a lot. We need **behavioural change**: also to avoid wasting food – awareness campaigns needed for consumers so they know what food is more sustainably produced (e.g. how much water used for production and processing of the food product). But also post-harvest management – this would also prevent water losses. The footprint needs to be clarified – so consumers become more aware. Can we turn the traditional certification system around, use digital means to ensure that it becomes clear to consumers what food is grown – **can we incentivize people by making more sustainably grown, better nutritious food less costly?** So reverse the current system of charging higher prices for more sustainably produced food that is only in reach to the happy few? Certification should not only focus on niche production areas but cover the whole production and consumption. Digitalization offers great potential with this regard. How can we make sure people diversify their diets and go to more vegetal production/consumption. There's over **100s of edible species** whereas the world population has converged their diets to few edible species only (10-15 cereals, nuts/pulses, tubers, vegetables). **Food safety** is an issue, it is shown by the covid situation – leverage this pandemic, **link up the food system with the health system.** How can we link up food (from farm to fork) to the health and food safety aspects.

We need to **reduce food losses and wastes**, in all sectors. Food chain aspects need to be looked into to come up with a strategy to resolve the situation. Loss and waste of food (1/4 of food consumption is wasted – can we reverse that? What would be the action to reduce food loss and waste – tool that brings harvesting processing and use together. Food distribution system needs to be looked into as it is not delivering food on time and to the right places. Food loss means water loss. We cannot reduce the water footprints without the consumers. Consumers should know how much water was necessary to produce e.g. a piece of beef.

Finance needs: There is a need of joined-up investments too, more finance is needed to make the vision reality. Bring in private sector and include new technology to have appropriate mechanisms to get finance that promote sustainable food production – green funding mechanism. It is not about financing huge and unsustainable irrigation systems but rather promoting sustainable ones.

1.2 What are the main areas of divergence amongst group members?

Potential divergence from audience vis-à-vis vision statement (but agreed by group members):

In terms of switching to locally adapted crops - in some areas there is still use of traditional methods for crop selection, irrigation, etc and these may be environmentally sound but this will not automatically lead to enough production as commercialization is better suited to those connected

to markets and able to afford inputs. Therefore, these traditional systems remain left out and unable to improve practices and increase livelihoods. So there is a mismatch between need for environmentally friendly production and need for food security.

1.3 What are the open questions identified by the group (if any)?

What do we mean by locally adapted crops as we will need high yielding (and nutritious) crops that are suited to produce enough to feed people. So do we mean traditional crops only or also consider upgrading crops that suit the environment.

Need to define how we will measure the success locally?

1.4 Do you have any additional comments from Round 1?

The book «life on a planet» by David Attenborough shows how much of the human population has grown, extractive methods of resource management has depleted stock of wild food (fish, animals, etc) and that much of the biodiversity is lost within a lifespan of 90 years, during which CO2 increased that is creating an even more hostile environment on earth. However, the book also describes how we can reverse this situation – by making our planet «wild» again. Many recommendations from this book would fit well with the vision «intact natural resources» that we are discussing.