

OFFICIAL FEEDBACK FORM

DIALOGUE DATE	Monday, 10 May 2021 11:00 GMT +03:00
DIALOGUE TITLE	Environmental global changes, local implications: challenges
CONVENED BY	Convenor: Prof. Noga Kronfeld-Schor, Ministry of Environmental Protection. Co-Convenors: Prof. Tamar Dayan, School of Zoology and The Steinhardt Museum of Natural History, and Dr. Alon Shepon, Porter School for Environmental studies, Tel Aviv
DIALOGUE EVENT PAGE	https://summitdialogues.org/dialogue/15760/
DIALOGUE TYPE	Member State
GEOGRAPHICAL FOCUS	Israel

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

67

PARTICIPATION BY AGE RANGE

0-18

19-30

31-50

51-65

66-80

80+

PARTICIPATION BY GENDER

39 Male

28 Female

Prefer not to say or Other

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS IN EACH SECTOR

16

Agriculture/crops
Fish and aquaculture
Livestock
Agro-forestry
Environment and ecology
Trade and commerce

Education
Communication
Food processing
Food retail, markets
Food industry
Financial Services

19

Health care
Nutrition
National or local government
Utilities
Industrial
Other

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS FROM EACH STAKEHOLDER GROUP

12

Small/medium enterprise/artisan
Large national business
Multi-national corporation
Small-scale farmer
Medium-scale farmer
Large-scale farmer
Local Non-Governmental Organization
International Non-Governmental Organization
Indigenous People
Science and academia

6

Workers and trade union
Member of Parliament

19

Local authority
Government and national institution
Regional economic community
United Nations
International financial institution
Private Foundation / Partnership / Alliance
Consumer group

5

Other

2. PRINCIPLES OF ENGAGEMENT

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

Recognizing the utmost urgency to take sustained and meaningful action to meet the 2030 Sustainable Development Goals, the dialogues are organized to identify the pathways to food systems transformation. We are committed to practicing what we preach in contribution to the Food Systems Summit. The dialogues empower stakeholders to participate in the preparations of the Food Systems Summit, while fostering new connections, enabling the emergence of new ways to move forward collectively and embracing the entire scope of opinions. Within our capacity and circumstances, we will promote food production and consumption policies and practices that strive to protect and improve the health and the well-being of individuals, enhance resilient livelihoods and communities, and promote stewardship of natural resources, while respecting local cultures and contexts. Respecting one another is the foundation for a genuine Dialogue. Participants in the Dialogues are expected to be attentive and open to a multitude of opinions. We recognize that food systems are complex, and are closely connected to, and significantly impacting human and animal health, natural resources, climate change, biodiversity and other related systems. Therefore, their transformation requires a systemic approach.

HOW DID YOUR DIALOGUE REFLECT SPECIFIC ASPECTS OF THE PRINCIPLES?

Dialogues are an opportunity to embrace the complexity of food systems. They promote a systemic approach by involving multiple stakeholders to identify actions across the system together with potential synergies and trade-offs. We support inclusive multi-stakeholder processes and approaches within governments and communities to allow for the design of policy options that deliver against multiple public goods across these various systems. The Dialogues bring to the table a diversity of stakeholders across the food system. They are inclusive and strive to showcase as many voices as possible, capturing diverse cultural, professional and gender specific perspectives. Recognizing that issues related to food systems are being addressed through several other global governance processes, we will seek to ensure that the Food Systems Summit aligns with these efforts where possible in order to avoid duplication, while encouraging bold and innovative new thinking and approaches. The Dialogues build on and add value to existing policy processes and initiatives. They provide an opportunity to share promising innovations, connect stakeholders, and broaden partnerships to transform food systems for the common good. We will work to ensure that the Summit and its associated engagement process promotes trust and increases motivation to participate by being evidence-based, transparent, and accessible. The Dialogues are curated and facilitated in a way which creates a “safe space” and promotes trust, encouraging mutual respect. The conclusions emerging from the Dialogues that are shared in the feedback and other media are not attributed to single individuals.

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

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 “Local implications of global challenges” Dialogue comprises seven round tables, which dealt with the following topics: Biodiversity; Open Landscapes; Invasive species; Water resources & supply; Climate changes; Marine resources; and Waste. The discussions focused on long-term planning to ensure food and water supply to Israel’s growing population regarding the food & water quantity, quality and safety in light of the crucial need to protect the environment. Moreover, long-term planning to ensure sustainable nutrition requires cooperation and synchronization between different government agencies, the industry and the producers.

The “Climate changes” table explored intensively Action track#2 in the meaning of reducing the local meat, fish and poultry consumption in different ways, among them encouraging the consumption of plant origin proteins, cultured meat or imposing a “Carbon tax” on consumable products, both local and imported.

The “Biodiversity” table mainly explored Action track#3 with an emphasis on the wide meanings of biodiversity regarding the agricultural industries and their specific interactions with nature and the environment. Another focus was on the benefits that agriculture receives from biodiversity, such as soil fertility, pollination and biological pest control.

The “Marine Resources” table discussed Action track#1 regarding the aquatic food production, from both fisheries and aquaculture. The marine-source food originates from four different taxonomic groups; Algae, mollusks, crustaceans and fish.; consumption of species of low trophic levels should become more dominant. Bycatch should be reduced or even used for human consumption.

In the “Water” table the main focus was on the long term planning and the need to ensure adequate and equitable water supply. Concurrently with seawater desalination and the developing of new techniques, the natural water resources must be preserved and restored.

In the “Open Landscapes” table the land designation was under debate; should intensive agriculture be the main purpose of agricultural land or should they be multi-functional and also answer cultural, ecological and other social needs.

The “Waste” table focused on the different types of waste through the food chain and the need to identify the specific actions relevant to each type. For example, to reduce waste from crop origin (surplus production), the producers can rely on crop-price insurance.

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

A major finding in our dialogue was the lack of long-term planning in different topics such as water management (fresh water, desalinated water, reclaimed sewage water), land management, aquatic resources and invasive species. Moreover, different policies may be unsynchronized and this leads to confusion and lack of uniformity, mainly among the food-producers. More transparency is required in the way the government, the supporting bodies, and the producers' organizations operate.

Regulation and enforcement seem to be a weak link in all the topics discussed in our dialogue. Moreover, because of lack of monitoring and supporting data, producers and supporting bodies are missing uniform validated protocols. Innovation and technology need more financial investment in order to create sustainable agriculture.

Agricultural lands are under continuous threats due to construction and infrastructures development. The main challenge is to keep the land for agricultural purposes together with multifunctional goals for culture, tourism, landscape and ecology. Economic incentives should be considered in order to develop the multifunctional uses of agricultural land, together with raising awareness in different communities for this goal.

We must adopt a dynamic and flexible management of the agricultural lands and the sea resources due to the climate change and its influence on breeding programs or crops selection. The utilization of sea and aquatic resources is expected to rise and in order to minimize the conflict with nature and environment demands, we must plan a head.

Use of the term "Food safety" appears to be ambiguous. Food safety refers to preserving soil, water and biological resources but also supporting the producers by investing in research and innovations in order to improve the efficiency and productivity under sustainable approach.

We need to improve efficiency in agricultural water use by differentiating the type of water and crops type. The predicted rising price of water due to consumption increase and infrastructure development should be considered. Agriculture must be based more on treated waste water.

The organic world-view should be an example for the waste handling and minimizing through all the steps from farm to fork. Israel has a unique geographical and political situation, which hampers the prevention of invasive species. International trade and import influenced by economical pressure can lead to new invasive species, for example with ornamental plants or animal food. Another finding is that compensation mechanisms for the producers are missing in cases of economic damages due to invasive species.

The carbon footprint of meat, poultry and fish consumption in Israel is high. We need to improve the awareness and knowledge of the agricultural sector to their influence on the environment and climate change and we should supply solutions and substitutions for this sector and the consumers.

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

OUTCOMES FOR EACH DISCUSSION TOPIC

Participants discussed the Challenges of each topic, and their findings are listed in the "Main Findings" section.

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

1. The role of agricultural land – is it only for intensive agriculture or are there other aspects like cultural, social and ecological roles?
2. Lack of trust between agricultural producers and environmental organizations prevents mutual initiative and interfere.

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