

OFFICIAL FEEDBACK FORM

DIALOGUE DATE	Thursday, 29 April 2021 14:00 GMT +02:00
DIALOGUE TITLE	EU Dialogue: Exploring Options to strengthen our Global Science Policy Interface for improved Food Systems Governance
CONVENED BY	European Commission; DG Research & Innovation
DIALOGUE EVENT PAGE	https://summitdialogues.org/dialogue/10758/
DIALOGUE TYPE	Independent
GEOGRAPHICAL FOCUS	No borders

The outcomes from a Food Systems Summit Dialogue will be of use in developing the pathway to sustainable food systems within the locality in which they take place. They will be a valuable contribution to the national pathways and also of interest to the different workstreams preparing for the Summit: the Action Tracks, Scientific Groups and Champions as well as for other Dialogues.

1. PARTICIPATION

TOTAL NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS

330

PARTICIPATION BY AGE RANGE

0 0-18 19 19-30 95 31-50 81 51-65 7 66-80 80+

PARTICIPATION BY GENDER

91 Male 108 Female 3 Prefer not to say or Other

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS IN EACH SECTOR

19	Agriculture/crops	25	Education	3	Health care
4	Fish and aquaculture	16	Communication	0	Nutrition
12	Livestock	16	Food processing	38	National or local government
9	Agro-forestry	10	Food retail, markets	0	Utilities
27	Environment and ecology	15	Food industry	3	Industrial
4	Trade and commerce	1	Financial Services	0	Other

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS FROM EACH STAKEHOLDER GROUP

7	Small/medium enterprise/artisan	1	Workers and trade union
4	Large national business	0	Member of Parliament
5	Multi-national corporation	6	Local authority
2	Small-scale farmer	45	Government and national institution
0	Medium-scale farmer	3	Regional economic community
0	Large-scale farmer	8	United Nations
5	Local Non-Governmental Organization	4	International financial institution
21	International Non-Governmental Organization	9	Private Foundation / Partnership / Alliance
1	Indigenous People	0	Consumer group
82	Science and academia	0	Other

2. PRINCIPLES OF ENGAGEMENT

HOW DID YOU ORGANIZE THE DIALOGUE SO THAT THE PRINCIPLES WERE INCORPORATED, REINFORCED AND ENHANCED?

Act with Urgency – In our agenda and invitation letter to the dialogue, we incorporated the sense of urgency which is in line with the European Green Deal, the EU Farm to fork Strategy and the UN Food Systems Summit's objective to accelerating the transition to sustainable, healthy and inclusive food systems and achieve the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) by 2030. The stakeholder dialogue was designed to both inform and solicit inputs from a wide diversity of actors working across the food system from science policy to production and consumption, at a global level, in particular international organisations, Members States and other policy makers, scientists and research organisations, knowledge providers, the private sector, civil society organisations/NGO and media. The Dialogue empowered stakeholders to participate and reflect on problems and solutions in the preparation of the Food Systems Summit.

HOW DID YOUR DIALOGUE REFLECT SPECIFIC ASPECTS OF THE PRINCIPLES?

We recognised that issues related to food systems are complex and must be addressed through several other global governance processes. Science can play a central role in collecting data from stakeholders, identifying challenges, synergies and trade-offs and increase global partnership. In their exchange, the participants were asked to think of Science Policy Interface(s)-related issues that need most urgent attention to support “food systems transition”, and to identify the principles of strengthened or new interface and propose concrete actions, share models, templates or experiences allowing to reach the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) by 2030. The feedback received from the stakeholders showed that we need better evidence to inform action at all scales. In order to meet the needs of diverse stakeholder groups, we need science, but also different kinds of science, evidence and data.

DO YOU HAVE ADVICE FOR OTHER DIALOGUE CONVENORS ABOUT APPRECIATING THE PRINCIPLES OF ENGAGEMENT?

It is important to allow ample time for the discussion sessions, experiences and the information sharing. It is good to keep in mind that the list of registered participants reduces as some do not attend. Also, if you plan to use IT tools to solicit questions or receive inputs, consider that not all attendees will use them. Of 330 people who took part in our dialogue, only 202 of these made active use of the IT platform we had made available to answer questionnaires and ask questions. In order to provide the statistics required in the official feedback form, we could only consider the 202 participants who answered the questions in the IT platforms, even though much more people actually joined the event but for which we have no statistics/information.

3. METHOD

The outcomes of a Dialogue are influenced by the method that is used.

DID YOU USE THE SAME METHOD AS RECOMMENDED BY THE CONVENORS REFERENCE MANUAL?

Yes

No

4. DIALOGUE FOCUS & OUTCOMES

MAJOR FOCUS

The stakeholder dialogue was designed to both inform and solicit inputs from a wide diversity of actors, in particular international organisations, Members States and other policy makers, scientists and research organisations, knowledge providers, the private sector, civil society organisations/NGO and media.

ACTION TRACKS

- ✓ Action Track 1: Ensure access to safe and nutritious food for all
- ✓ Action Track 2: Shift to sustainable consumption patterns
- ✓ Action Track 3: Boost nature-positive production
- ✓ Action Track 4: Advance equitable livelihoods
- ✓ Action Track 5: Build resilience to vulnerabilities, shocks and stress

KEYWORDS

- | | | | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Finance | ✓ | Policy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Innovation | ✓ | Data & Evidence |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Human rights | ✓ | Governance |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Women & Youth Empowerment | <input type="checkbox"/> | Trade-offs |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Environment and Climate |

MAIN FINDINGS

In Science Policy Interface(s) (SPIs), it is essential to consider different sources of knowledge. Knowledge should not be seen only as scientific publications, but also other sources of knowledge (grey literature, local knowledge, etc.) should be considered. Food should not be seen only as nutrition and energy; the cultural aspects of food also need to be considered in the future SPIs. Importance of transparency and inclusion in relation to SPIs, need to avoid polarisation of debate around technology (by taking into account also the role of social innovation), importance of two-way communication and citizen participation (as evidenced by the audience's interest in Living Labs and Food Policy Councils emerged during the Slido exercise).

Legitimacy and mandate are precursors to impact. Legitimacy can come through different ways, like: independent science, the UN as a structure, or through representation and participation. Though should we want a mandate to act in food systems, then it must extend beyond nation states.

ACTION TRACKS

- ✓ Action Track 1: Ensure access to safe and nutritious food for all
- ✓ Action Track 2: Shift to sustainable consumption patterns
- ✓ Action Track 3: Boost nature-positive production
- ✓ Action Track 4: Advance equitable livelihoods
- ✓ Action Track 5: Build resilience to vulnerabilities, shocks and stress

KEYWORDS

- | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|
| Finance | ✓ Policy |
| Innovation | ✓ Data & Evidence |
| Human rights | ✓ Governance |
| Women & Youth Empowerment | Trade-offs |
| | Environment and Climate |

OUTCOMES FOR EACH DISCUSSION TOPIC

Importance of synthesising different positions (maintaining the evidence-based approach), the need to reflect on the difference between multi-stakeholderism vs. multilateralism (and how to organise the dialogue with civil society), the importance of learning from more localised experiences (where participation seems to be more effective and it is often easier to connect food system actors).

Looking forward and stressing the need to improve (not replace) existing structures is a priority. UN Food Systems Summit is a great tool for having a more structured dialogue and ask for specific engagement with different stakeholder (e.g., private sector guiding group and leadership teams of each of the action tracks). Considering the role of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) that offers some key guidelines in that it has similarities to the High Level Panel of Experts on Food Security and Nutrition (HLPE) but different way of operating. In particular, the IPCC has done a lot of work on assessing quality of evidence and confidence of quality of evidence.

ACTION TRACKS

- ✓ Action Track 1: Ensure access to safe and nutritious food for all
- ✓ Action Track 2: Shift to sustainable consumption patterns
- ✓ Action Track 3: Boost nature-positive production
- ✓ Action Track 4: Advance equitable livelihoods
- ✓ Action Track 5: Build resilience to vulnerabilities, shocks and stress

KEYWORDS

- Finance
- Innovation
- Human rights
- Women & Youth Empowerment
- Policy
- Data & Evidence
- Governance
- Trade-offs
- Environment and Climate

AREAS OF DIVERGENCE

Four areas of divergence:

- 1) Role of High Level Panel of Experts on Food Security and Nutrition (HLPE) (many important learnings, strengths and weaknesses). Also: need to distinguish between HLPE/ UN Committee on World Food Security (CFS, which is a political body, while HLPE is a small scientific panel). Importantly, HLPE has a 15-person steering committee and also has a mandate to explore disagreements. Cons of CFS/HLPE: Small high-level group is fine but cannot have the level of representation needed; silos between HLPE, civil society, private sector. Pros of CFS/HLPE: It is the only legitimate-UN embedded body. However, there are different interpretations of "legitimacy" as some argue that this comes through local participation.
- 2) Nature of evidence and role of science (Values versus evidence). One camp suggests that food is different from country to country as there are many more cultural/value-based elements in food systems so roll of a Science Policy Interface(s) for food systems must balance the need to create a space for debate and make clear recommendations. One camp suggests science needs to be "objective" and value-free. Relevance of science is the scientific evidence used to drive/inform change? If not, then it's likely not fit for purpose.
- 3) Scale. Need for local Science Policy Interface(s) (SPIs) and not just global ones.
- 4) Existing vs. new SPIs: some argue the use of existing entities, others argue the need for something new.

ACTION TRACKS

- ✓ Action Track 1: Ensure access to safe and nutritious food for all
- ✓ Action Track 2: Shift to sustainable consumption patterns
- ✓ Action Track 3: Boost nature-positive production
- ✓ Action Track 4: Advance equitable livelihoods
- ✓ Action Track 5: Build resilience to vulnerabilities, shocks and stress

KEYWORDS

- Finance
- Innovation
- Human rights
- Women & Youth Empowerment
- Policy
- Data & Evidence
- Governance
- Trade-offs
- Environment and Climate