

OFFICIAL FEEDBACK FORM

DIALOGUE DATE	Wednesday, 7 July 2021 09:30 GMT +01:00
DIALOGUE TITLE	Leave No-one Behind: The Transition to Sustainable Agriculture
CONVENED BY	Aran Shaunak: Editor at FoodUnfolded, EIT Food
DIALOGUE EVENT PAGE	https://summitdialogues.org/dialogue/13977/
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

PARTICIPATION BY AGE RANGE

0	0-18	18	19-30	28	31-50	2	51-65	1	66-80	0	80+
---	------	----	-------	----	-------	---	-------	---	-------	---	-----

PARTICIPATION BY GENDER

24	Male	24	Female	1	Prefer not to say or Other
----	------	----	--------	---	----------------------------

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS IN EACH SECTOR

6	Agriculture/crops	2	Education	0	Health care
7	Fish and aquaculture	0	Communication	0	Nutrition
11	Livestock	0	Food processing	0	National or local government
1	Agro-forestry	2	Food retail, markets	0	Utilities
5	Environment and ecology	9	Food industry	0	Industrial
0	Trade and commerce	1	Financial Services	4	Other

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS FROM EACH STAKEHOLDER GROUP

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

2. PRINCIPLES OF ENGAGEMENT

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

The UNFSS has already organised a number of dialogues on similar topics, so we aimed to complement this work by focusing on recruiting young people, as well as practitioners (e.g. farmers, fishers) to our dialogue, in the hope of bringing in additional and lesser-heard perspectives to the wider conversation. We worked hard during recruitment to find and make space for people from varying sectors, considering cultural, geographical, time-zone, and language differences. We brought people together from different backgrounds, even where perspectives and agendas may be wildly different, e.g. multinational corporations and small farmers. While recruiting, we also made sure we included a certain number of people who are familiar with the main theme of discussion and already understand the problem so they could contribute and discuss solutions from a solid basis of knowledge. We asked every participant to commit to the “practical” outcome of the dialogue and to only bring to the table solutions that they would be themselves willing to follow through with in practice. We recognise that the issue of making food chains more sustainable whilst supporting producers depends on many different factors and requires action on multiple levels to manage. For this reason, we decided to include as wide a cross-section of representatives from each part of the food chain as we could and encouraged discussion between people from different sectors of the same food chains in order to build mutual understanding, respect and trust. We were transparent with participants about the outcome of the dialogues, and explained we would be taking notes according to Chatham House rules. We promised to treat comments confidentially and anonymously. We told participants that we would have liked the conversation to be very spontaneous and positive, trying to build on top of each other's ideas respectfully. We also said we didn't want anyone to feel that they didn't have enough expertise to contribute to the conversation – if they had been chosen to be there, we wanted to hear what they had to say.

HOW DID YOUR DIALOGUE REFLECT SPECIFIC ASPECTS OF THE PRINCIPLES?

Act with urgency. We made sure that the conversation focused on the next 3-5 years and revolved around specific, realistic and practical solutions. Be respectful. Everyone in the dialogue was encouraged to be respectful of others' perspectives. Every friction and divergence was dealt with a constructive approach. We promoted food production and consumption policies and practices that strive to protect and improve the health and well-being of individuals, communities, and ecosystems – while at the same time respecting local cultures and contexts. Recognise complexity. Throughout the dialogue, we always recognised that food systems are complex, and closely connected to (and significantly impact) human and animal health, land, water, climate, biodiversity, the economy, and geopolitics. We allowed and encouraged disagreement with proposed solutions and recognised that solutions likely will not be easy to implement. We recognised that solutions were needed on multiple levels, and asked participants to vote on each group's main suggested solutions. Embrace multi-stakeholder inclusivity - We encouraged conversation between members of different stakeholder groups, and ensured that everyone was always involved in the conversation and invited everyone to express themselves on each topic of discussion. Complement the work of others - We developed our own unique and relaxed style of hosting and wide recruitment from throughout the sector in an effort to stimulate new discussions that would lead to new solutions. Build trust - We committed to creating a relaxed and friendly atmosphere to build trust and an open airing of truthful views. We created a spreadsheet where each participant could drop their personal details in case they wanted to be contacted by other participants or by us. We let participants know that we would send the final feedback report to them, drafted according to Chatham House rules. Participants also know that they might be offered follow-up opportunities with FoodUnfolded to reach our audience about important issues.

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

We have found that creating interactive polls during the plenary session allows us to stimulate engagement from the very beginning of the event and to keep a higher level of attention throughout the event. Music whilst waiting also worked well for this purpose.

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

Producing our food has far-reaching impacts on our atmosphere, the lives of humans, the welfare of billions of animals and the health of our land and seas, not to mention the incomes of billions of people and the economies of every nation across the globe. Global agriculture is a hugely complex web of externalities that must be dealt with, but it is also the single largest employment sector globally, with over a billion people (around 1/3 of the global workforce) reliant on it for their livelihood.

This dialogue on “Leaving no one behind” revolved around how we can reduce the environmental impacts of our agriculture systems and wild-catch fisheries through transitioning towards more sustainable production methods - but crucially, with a focus on the people who currently work in those industries and how that transition can be made in a way that supports, rather than undermines, the people that depend on those industries for their livelihoods.

A sustainable food system may also involve eating more of some things, but less of others. This dialogue also explored what would happen to current producers of what some would consider “unsustainable” foods if demand for them falls in future, and how we could work with people who rely on these industries to ensure they are able to adapt and survive nonetheless.

We focused here on 4 major food sectors/chains: meat, dairy, fish and palm oil. In each discussion group, we explored what the barriers are to that particular food chain moving towards more sustainable production methods, and how we could realise more sustainable production in each area without leaving behind the farmers, fishers and other workers that depend on those industries for their livelihoods.

The main solutions identified overall were:

- 1. Make food more valuable: higher incomes for farmers would mean greater capacity for them to invest in sustainable change. Margins could be widened through changes in business models, shortening supply chains, consumers/retailers/manufacturers valuing sustainable food more highly, finding uses for waste products or alternative farm ownership models.
- 2. Involve and support farmers and fishers: Innovations, solutions and policies need to be flexible to local needs and developed in partnership with practitioners to ensure they are useful and beneficial in the field. Financial support and access to information and education would help farmers/fishers transition to more sustainable practices.
- 3. Help consumers change their diets: Consumers need clear, trustworthy sustainability data on food labels in order to inform purchasing decisions and boost markets for sustainable foods. Existing certifications need to be more transparent and robust.
- 4. Enforce change and rebuild trust: Governments need to incentivise sustainable production and perhaps penalise producers who do not transition their production methods (certain practices could even be made requirements). All stakeholders (including consumers) need to move forward with a positive outlook and work together to realise change, rather than competing/boycotting/catastrophizing.

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

MAIN FINDINGS

Participants immediately highlighted the issues of unsustainably low incomes for farmers and uncertainty over the future. In line with this, economic sustainability for farmers was identified as a key barrier to change across all four food chains discussed (meat, fish, dairy, palm oil). Although many beneficial technologies and best practices exist/are being developed, farmers (especially small/medium sized) have thin margins and so often don't have the mental or financial capacity to properly consider and invest in the transition towards more sustainable practices or implement new technologies.

Increasing incomes for farmers is therefore key. Potential solutions include: a fairer distribution of profits throughout the supply chain (e.g. Through supply chain-wide profit sharing agreements, shorter supply chains or direct trade), higher food prices for consumers (e.g. selling higher quality produce at lower volume or minimum pricing), alternative farm ownership models (e.g. shared community ownership) and putting "waste" to better use (e.g. creating new markets for bycatch fish).

Sustainable innovations/practices need to also be developed and presented to farmers in a way that adds value, rather than just adding costs. Business models can help communicate the long-term value of making changes to farmers, while governments and civil organisations can support transitions by offering grants/support to offset short-term costs. Financial penalties/withdrawal of existing support for farmers that produce unsustainably and/or are not transitioning could supplement this approach. Governments could also make specific sustainability practices required and enforceable rather than voluntary - though we must consider the global ramifications of this to avoid unforeseen consequences elsewhere.

Both innovations and policy should be developed with input from local producers to ensure they're useful and relevant in practice to those that will be using/affected by them. Policy must be flexible between nations and even within nations to reflect the needs and challenges faced by local producers in varying situations and cultures. Young farmers and fishers are the best placed for involvement as they are the most engaged with the sustainability movement and the most willing to adjust existing practices - but still place a strong emphasis on being able to make a living.

Changes in consumer diets are key to allowing higher-value, lower-volume production that would relieve demand pressure on these industries and enable more sustainable production practices. Consumers can drive change through their purchases, but are currently unable to access clear and reliable information on food sustainability to guide their decisions. Existing sustainability certifications have value, but are often inaccessible to smaller producers and not well trusted by consumers. Certification organisations must be more transparent about the evidence supporting "certified sustainable" producers, and offer application support to smaller producers.

We can further empower consumers to make informed choices by developing new sustainability food labels. But such labels must be built on robust sustainability frameworks and metrics (currently lacking, decisions here could be controversial); data collection methods that are accessible, affordable and realistic for even small farmers to use; and policies that ensure producers and processors track these sustainability metrics and communicate them via product labels (will require education and engagement initiatives).

In the meantime, responsibility to drive change can not be on consumers - asking consumers to use their power in the absence of appropriate education and information is an industry cop-out. Instead, policymakers need to help farmers transition and use legislation and/or market-based financial incentives to make low-impact products more attractive to price-conscious consumers than high impact ones (especially in high consumption highly price-sensitive markets e.g. India and China); companies need to place more value on and be willing to pay more for sustainable ingredients; and retailers need to value food products on an individual basis, rather than taking a loss on some (e.g. cheap milk) to drive purchases of others.

New alternatives to meat/fish/dairy/palm oil (e.g. cultured meat, alternative milks) were seen as having a valuable role to play in reducing demand pressure on these industries to produce more, but were not seen as a wholesale replacement for these foods (due to incomplete nutritional profiles, limited popularity relative to traditional foods and potential environmental footprints when scaled up.) Traditional and alternative industries should exist in healthy competition with one another, rather than fighting to keep each other down.

All four industries need to turn the prevailing conversation into one of positivity and change. Producers are currently focusing on doomsday scenarios while consumers/activists talk of "boycotting" foods perceived as high impact. True change will instead come from all stakeholders supporting these industries in their transition to more sustainable production - even those who personally choose alternatives. This will also help portray farmers and fishers more accurately as actors who care deeply about the welfare of people, animals and the environment, helping rebuild the damaged trust between consumers and producers.

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 - 1/4

How we can shift meat production towards more sustainable production methods whilst supporting those who depend on the meat sector?

Economic viability for farmers was identified as a major issue. More sustainable methods are currently perceived as more expensive by many farmers. If we want farmers to adopt more sustainable methods, we need to make them cheaper/ensure they add value rather than just increasing costs, as there is not enough margin in meat farming currently for farmers to absorb short-term costs in the pursuit of long-term improvements in sustainability. Many meat farmers also could not switch to growing alternative produce, as the land is only suitable for growing grass for grazing and could not sustain crops.

Part of the solution to this is bringing farmers' voices into the conversation so solutions and practices can be found that have considered the practicalities and economics of meat farming from the start. The involvement of local farmers and the tailoring of sustainability-focused solutions/methods to the specific economic, environmental, social and cultural conditions of different nations and even different areas within nations is essential, as what works in one place and for one set of farmers may not work for another. Young farmers would be the best to engage in this conversation, as they have a longer-term view regarding our environment and are more open to new technologies and new approaches that could reduce the impact of meat farming. Forcing the implementation of one-size-doesn't-fit-all solutions is likely to do more harm than good and damage farmers' trust in policymakers and the sustainability movement as a whole (for example, solutions that reduce meat production in the UK and Ireland but don't reduce domestic demand would likely lead to increased importing of meat from South America, which has a much higher environmental footprint).

Many meat farmers would also benefit from better training/education/access to information about sustainability, to combat the perception that all sustainable farming methods come with higher costs/lower profits, even where the evidence does not support this conclusion. Information/education/research needs to be presented in a way that is practical and useful in the real world, and that farmers can engage with and understand. Education and communication also have a key role to play in helping consumers reconnect with their food and how it is grown to increase the value that society places on meat - especially when grown sustainably - and to better understand the variation in the impact of how meat is produced on different farms in different parts of the world using different production methods. Platforms like FoodUnfolded are important for doing this work.

On that note, everyone agreed that consumer behaviour has to change with a move towards eating less meat (though that meat could be of higher quality/cost/produced more sustainably). The group felt that this change would need to be government-led, perhaps through policy-driven laws/restrictions or financial/market-based incentives/penalties/taxes. Higher costs for sustainably produced meat, new distribution methods (e.g. direct trade between farmer and consumer) or alternative farm ownership structures (e.g. community ownership) could all provide higher-value markets for farmers to produce and sell less meat but still make a living. Meat alternatives such as cultured meat were not seen as a sustainable long-term alternative to reducing our meat consumption.

Many felt smaller farms were easier to run sustainably and could build connections and trust with local communities more effectively than larger, more commercial farms. Relying on smaller farms for meat production could be more feasible if meat consumption/demand were to fall, thus providing another route towards more sustainable meat production (at lower volume). One barrier to this that was identified is high land values, as farmland is being sold/broken up for development or amalgamation into larger farms, making access to land harder for small farmers.

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 - 2/4

How can we shift dairy production towards more sustainable production methods whilst supporting those who depend on the dairy sector?

Economic viability for farmers was identified as a major issue. It currently pays to produce as much milk as possible due to low prices and a lack of financial incentives. Moreover, actions to improve the sustainability of dairy will carry additional costs to farmers - so systemic change is needed to increase the value of milk.

First, retailers' view of milk must change. Milk (viewed by many as an essential) is usually placed at the back of the shop (and priced as low as possible) so that consumers enter the shop and walk past other food, encouraging further purchases. Cheap milk is therefore almost a means of advertising, with some supermarkets deliberately making a loss on milk. We (consumers and retailers alike) need to see milk as a product in its own right - minimum pricing of milk in supermarkets was discussed as a potential solution to this issue.

Demand for dairy will not evaporate overnight, so the messaging surrounding the dairy industry used by all parties - governments, retailers, farmers and consumers - needs to change to become one of positivity rather than negativity. There are too many doomsday messages concerning "the end of the industry" among farmers - and a huge focus on the footprint of dairy and "eliminating dairy" among consumers and activists - when in reality engaging with opportunities to improve production together with changes in consumer perceptions and demand could lead to the development of a sustainable dairy industry which operates happily alongside the dairy alternatives industry.

Governments can support this transition in messaging by linking all future government support to sustainable practices that encourage regenerative/lower impact dairy farming practices, rather than simply subsidising milk production based on quantity. Dairy producers must change their mindset from viewing dairy alternatives as an existential threat and instead see them as healthy competition, using this as an incentive and inspiration to strive for more sustainable dairy production - rather than trying to hinder the development of the dairy alternatives industry. Governments can support this by resisting lobbying against dairy alternatives whilst simultaneously offering support to dairy farmers attempting to transition to more sustainable practices and offering incentives for producing sustainably.

Consumers can also support this transition not only by engaging with dairy alternatives but also by putting greater value on sustainably produced milk. This will help create a more valuable market, thus providing greater incentives for dairy farmers to transition to more sustainable production methods.

However, in order for this "social licensing" approach to be successful, we need to develop reliable, evidence-based sustainability metrics and clear sustainability labelling linked to production processes and environmental benchmarks, and education for farmers and the public alike in how to use them. The impact of this would be twofold: first, it provides farmers with the clear data and frameworks they need to assess the impact of their own production systems and evaluate what changes they should make to reduce that impact; second, it provides consumers with the information they need to make informed decisions and highlights the importance of doing so, thus empowering them to support sustainable dairy products over unsustainable ones and create market incentives for dairy farmers to invest in transitioning to more sustainable production methods.

Finally, market failures in the industry have led to a breakdown in trust between consumers and dairy farmers. In reality, most want to produce sustainably and are happy to produce less provided incomes remain acceptable. Building personal connections between dairy farmers and consumers (e.g. through on-farm visits, farmers markets or initiatives like FarmerTime) would help rebuild damaged trust and encourage consumers to place greater value on sustainable dairy and the farmers that produce it, augmenting the effectiveness of other solu

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 - 3/4

How can we shift wild-catch fisheries towards more sustainable production methods whilst supporting those who depend on the fishing sector?

Economic viability for fishers was identified as a major issue. Fishing boats are high-pressure environments in which to make a living, and difficult places to implement new processes or technologies - like farmers, fishers want to strive to operate sustainably but can only do so once their basic needs/incomes are met.

Using bycatch more effectively was identified as a way of adding value to the fishing industry whilst reducing environmental impacts. Governments, retailers and the food industry must all work together to invest in and promote the eating of less-popular fish species that are plentiful, sustainable and often currently discarded as bycatch by fishers due to lack of demand. Food manufacturers could also support this by processing more sustainable species (e.g. sardines) into more attractive (e.g. more appealing/convenient/affordable/familiar) food products such as fishcakes. Meanwhile, restaurants can inform and inspire customers by choosing to use bycatch in their dishes. This would create a market for local, sustainable fish while reducing waste and unnecessary death of bycatch on fishing vessels, creating value for all actors in the food chain and reducing environmental footprints as well as relieving demand pressure on the most fished and imported species (e.g. tuna, cod, salmon).

Sustainability certifications are an important part of making fishing more sustainable, but NGOs providing them must set higher, more comprehensive standards for fishers to meet and be more transparent and provide consumers with more evidence as to their value and meaning in order for consumers to trust and value those certifications. NGOs and governments should also offer fishers, especially small-scale ones, more support in applying for and securing sustainability certifications, as application costs and requirements can be prohibitive for small-scale operators. Fishers should also be incentivised, for example via funding opportunities or financial incentives, to implement alternative practices and new technologies that reduce their footprint on the seas so as to offset the costs of doing so.

Engaging fishers earlier in the sustainability conversation as active participants is also critical. Innovators must not just create new approaches and technological solutions for fishers, but should include their views during design and development to ensure that solutions are practical and useful and fit for purpose in the real world. Local fishers should be included in policymaking around sustainable fishing (e.g. when deciding which bycatch fish should be promoted to consumers and industry) in order to ensure that solutions and initiatives are appropriate to the state of fishing in the local area. Policies must be flexible to reflect the realities of local fishers since the situation may vary between and even within nations.

Most importantly, we need to improve communication not just between fishers and policymakers, but between all stakeholders. Policies should be based on evidence and data, but researchers, scientists and corporations must ensure they collect high-quality data on the right subjects and in the right areas, develop clear definitions of what is and isn't considered sustainable in the fishing industry, and communicate these definitions to policymakers and consumers in a way that is understandable. Consumers have huge power to change practices through their market choices, but we must first make the relevant information available and accessible to them through clear and engaging communication so they can make informed choices. Since there is rarely a consensus in fisheries science, researchers must also find a way to explain the natural uncertainties and disagreements present in the data, to avoid conflicts and prevent the undermining of public trust when conclusions change.

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 - 4/4

How can we shift palm oil production towards more sustainable production methods whilst supporting those who depend on the palm oil sector?

Economic viability for smallholder palm oil farmers was identified as a major issue. Solutions, approaches and technologies for producing palm oil more sustainably must be made accessible and available to smallholder farmers through education and training, but more importantly through clear business cases that show smallholders ways to implement changes that simultaneously reduce their environmental footprints and bring economic returns in the short and long term - otherwise it is unlikely they will agree to invest in more sustainable approaches. This could be supported by microfinance opportunities, grants or other financial tools provided by governments, industry coalitions and civil society that directly incentivise and support smallholder farmers to move towards more sustainable production. A key area of focus for researchers and innovators should be increasing yield per hectare, as this would boost farmer incomes and production outputs without increasing land use.

Change among smallholder farmers could be supported by ensuring that profits from the palm oil industry are more equitably divided along the supply chain and farmers (and especially smallholders) receive their fair share, as higher incomes would facilitate investment by farmers in more sustainable production approaches. A fairer distribution of profits specifically in certified sustainable palm oil chains, and therefore higher farmer incomes, could also become an incentive for farmers to switch to more sustainable production methods. Wealthier palm oil-consuming countries can invest in sustainable production by the food industry (and consumers) valuing and being willing to pay slightly more for certified sustainable palm oil - but the focus of the responsibility for this should shift from consumers to companies.

Smallholders would also benefit from existing knowledge being better distributed throughout the whole supply chain. By optimising tools like private standards, sustainable market models and sustainability schemes to make it easier for smallholders to access them, we can facilitate the sharing of skills and knowledge around best practices between smallholders and from larger farms to smallholders. Larger farms, corporations and policymakers would also gain a better understanding of the issues facing smallholders from their perspective, allowing closer cooperation and the building of trust between all actors in the supply chain.

For larger farms, current sustainable practices and schemes are voluntary in nature. Policymakers in palm oil-producing countries must replace these with binding instruments that ensure better accountability among farmers - but this must also be supported by similar policies in palm oil-consuming countries to ensure that accountability is maintained throughout the supply chain across international borders. Producing countries cannot solve the problem alone.

It is also critical to tackle the lack of demand for sustainable palm oil in developing countries. Consumer demand drove change in developed markets in favour of sustainable palm oil production, but consumer demand for sustainable palm oil in price-sensitive emerging markets such as India and China remains weak and insufficient to drive change. Policymakers both in these countries and internationally must act to promote or legislate in favour of sustainable palm oil in order to bolster the global market for sustainable palm oil and drive more producers to switch to more sustainable methods. Widening the definition of "sustainable palm oil" to include human and social impacts rather than just environmental footprint may help here.

Palm oil alternatives could help to relieve some of the production pressure on tropical palm oil-producing regions, though we must be vigilant of the environmental footprints of these alternatives given the high crop yield efficiency of oil palm.

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

AREAS OF DIVERGENCE

Some participants felt that smaller farms were inherently more sustainable than larger farms, but others argued that this is simply an issue of scale - practices that work on a small farm are not suitable or practical for large-scale farming, and would have major environmental, social or economic impacts if scaled up. Therefore smaller farms may not actually be any more sustainable than larger farms when taking into account how much food we need to produce to feed the global population.

While some participants felt meat, dairy, fish and palm oil alternatives were the way forward in place of the original products, most felt that these are not likely to completely replace existing foodstuffs but could work alongside existing food industries to temper consumer demand and take some of the demand and therefore production pressure off these 4 food chains, helping them to reduce their environmental footprints in the process. Some also argued that these alternatives could have their own dramatic environmental footprints when production is scaled up and advised caution and vigilance.

Some participants felt raising food prices and asking consumers to pay more was a valid approach, while others were concerned that this could price out lower-income individuals and countries from purchasing the food they need, pushing people further into poverty. Most agreed that raising prices would be more appropriate in wealthier countries than in lower-income ones.

While those working in certification were confident in the value and role played by sustainability certification schemes, other participants were less convinced and wanted operating organisations to set higher standards and provide more evidence/transparency as to the true value of these certifications.

While all participants recognised the power of the consumer to drive change and the value of consumers being well informed, most also felt that the responsibility for driving change should not fall on consumers but be pushed forwards by governments, companies, farmers and large-scale organisations.

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

ATTACHMENTS AND RELEVANT LINKS

ATTACHMENTS

- **Manifesto (Outcomes Summary)**

CORRECTIONS, ADJUSTMENTS, OR CHANGES

Title Clarifying the use of the word "Replace" in the discussion around palm oil

Date 23/07/2021

In the summary of the discussion group focused around palm oil, we included "For larger farms, current sustainable practices and schemes are voluntary in nature. Policymakers in palm oil-producing countries must replace these with binding instruments that ensure better accountability among farmers..." Participants would like to clarify any misunderstandings that might arise from the use of the word "replace" in this context. To clarify: participants felt that existing voluntary certifications should be enhanced, enforced or empowered or put into legislative frameworks in both producing and consuming countries, in order to improve the adoption of these standards by producers. This action is not intended to suggest that existing voluntary certifications themselves should be "replaced", only that additional mechanisms could be used to take them beyond being purely voluntary schemes in an effort to increase the number of producers adhering to them.