

# OFFICIAL FEEDBACK FORM

<b>DIALOGUE DATE</b>	Tuesday, 20 July 2021 11:00 GMT -07:00
<b>DIALOGUE TITLE</b>	Roadmap to Climate Neutrality in the Beef and Dairy Sectors
<b>CONVENED BY</b>	Dr. Frank Mitloehner, Director, UC Davis CLEAR Center & Dr. Ermias Kebreab, Director, UC Davis World Food Center
<b>DIALOGUE EVENT PAGE</b>	<a href="https://summitdialogues.org/dialogue/19148/">https://summitdialogues.org/dialogue/19148/</a>
<b>DIALOGUE TYPE</b>	Independent
<b>GEOGRAPHICAL FOCUS</b>	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

30

## PARTICIPATION BY AGE RANGE

0-18

0

19-30

13

31-50

15

51-65

2

66-80

80+

## PARTICIPATION BY GENDER

16 Male

14 Female

Prefer not to say or Other

## NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS IN EACH SECTOR

Agriculture/crops

Fish and aquaculture

5 Livestock

Agro-forestry

3 Environment and ecology

Trade and commerce

10 Education

Communication

Food processing

Food retail, markets

5 Food industry

Financial Services

Health care

Nutrition

7 National or local government

Utilities

Industrial

Other

## NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS FROM EACH STAKEHOLDER GROUP

1 Small/medium enterprise/artisan

2 Large national business

Multi-national corporation

Small-scale farmer

Medium-scale farmer

Large-scale farmer

Local Non-Governmental Organization

3 International Non-Governmental Organization

Indigenous People

10 Science and academia

Workers and trade union

Member of Parliament

Local authority

7 Government and national institution

Regional economic community

United Nations

International financial institution

7 Private Foundation / Partnership / Alliance

Consumer group

Other

## 2. PRINCIPLES OF ENGAGEMENT

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

This dialogue was convened by the University of California [CLEAR Center, UC Davis and World Food Center, UC Davis]. This dialogue was organized as expert-to-expert discussions focused on science-based innovations developed in collaboration between academic, government, industry and NGO partners, many of whom represented farmers large and small. The three discussions focused on looking forward and enabling the emergence of ways to move forward collectively and creatively, embracing the entire scope of opinions while fostering new connections. Our participants represented many different stakeholders who recognized the complexity of food systems. The discussion groups were diverse so as to complement the work of each other, and to connect and share information and innovations so as to build trust across the board.

### HOW DID YOUR DIALOGUE REFLECT SPECIFIC ASPECTS OF THE PRINCIPLES?

This dialogue was held on July 20, 2021 and a video recording was immediately posted at (<https://clear.ucdavis.edu/news/uc-davis-clear-center-and-world-food-center-convene-independent-dialogue-un-food-systems> and at <https://worldfoodcenter.ucdavis.edu/news/uc-davis-clear-center-and-world-food-center-convene-independent-dialogue-un-food-systems>). Immediate posting of the video represents our commitment to UN principles of engagement to “act with urgency” and to “build trust” by being “evidence-based, transparent, and accessible” in our work. The recording captures participants’ respectful commitment to “move forward collectively and creatively.” Experts in the videos exhibit deep recognition of the systems complexities in efforts at “promotion of food production, protection of the health and well-being of individuals, enhancement of resilient livelihoods and communities, and stewardship of natural resources.” It is our hope that this dialogue serves to “share promising innovations, connect stakeholders, and broaden partnerships to transform food systems for the common good.”

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

As with any such events, additional planning time allows one to attend to the high ideals and systems complexities embodied in 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

This dialogue's major focus was an exploration of Action Track 3 of the Summit, Boost nature-positive production.

### 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

## MAIN FINDINGS

A common theme in all of the three discussions within this dialogue was the need for a systems approach that takes into account global production of beef and dairy products.

We will need to see both developed and developing countries make good use of better practices and technological improvements in efficiency and mitigation strategies that are incentivized to limit burden of producers. Without a market for things like manure byproducts and ecosystem services, for example, ranchers operate on thin margins and will not be able to implement mitigation strategies which inevitably will raise their costs. Panelists and participants agreed that removing barriers, doing more research on enteric solutions, and developing product markets encourage sustainability. It is incumbent on all global regions to develop climate-smart solutions if we are to reduce absolute greenhouse gas emissions from this sector. Large-scale climate change benefits when a combination of methane mitigation strategies are achieved in beef and dairy.

### ACTION TRACKS

<input type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 1: Ensure access to safe and nutritious food for all
<input type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 2: Shift to sustainable consumption patterns
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 3: Boost nature-positive production
<input type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 4: Advance equitable livelihoods
<input type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 5: Build resilience to vulnerabilities, shocks and stress

### KEYWORDS

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

## OUTCOMES FOR EACH DISCUSSION TOPIC - 1/3

The U.S. beef and dairy sectors can be climate neutral. The question is: How soon?

Answering that question will depend on how we choose to assess and measure. There will always be trade-offs when it comes to reducing greenhouse gas emissions. How we choose to evaluate these trade-offs will affect whether or how we can achieve climate neutrality. Mitigation comes at a cost and policy can address societal needs in a way that makes mitigation economically feasible. All the while we need to be in dialogue with farmers and ranchers, sharing information, as well as getting their input. Connecting and reaching the next generation of farmers will be critical in finding ways to leverage technology to improve efficiencies for livestock farmers. Educating multiple audiences such as consumer, farmers, the public, decision makers is necessary. Producers must be involved when building communication plans and programs from the ground up. This remains complex as it examines multiple impacts of sustainability such as social, economic, and environmental impacts. What a policy might incentivize might not be what the farmer or rancher needs or is feasible to implement, and therefore not be practically achievable. Market incentives, grants, and markets for greenhouse gas reductions and other ecosystem services are critical to successful adoption of mitigation measures. Putting research realities into an achievable timeline acknowledges the time it takes to do mitigation research and bring those solutions to market. We need more research funding on various aspects of the system and that research needs to be funded, not only by industry, but also governments and non-profits.

### ACTION TRACKS

<input type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 1: Ensure access to safe and nutritious food for all
<input type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 2: Shift to sustainable consumption patterns
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 3: Boost nature-positive production
<input type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 4: Advance equitable livelihoods
<input type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 5: Build resilience to vulnerabilities, shocks and stress

### KEYWORDS

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

## OUTCOMES FOR EACH DISCUSSION TOPIC - 2/3

Public policy can incentivize an acceleration of climate-smart solutions in beef and dairy production to reach climate neutrality.

We need a standardized life-cycle analysis of the beef and dairy systems that can be used regionally and more broadly. Ultimately climate neutrality for the sectors cannot happen without policy and a mechanism to incentivize farmers and ranchers to mitigate greenhouse gasses. Programs that allow farmers to sell the energy they make from tools such as dairy biodigesters back to the grid, can make the investment in the technology worth the cost. Not being able to reverse meter is a big policy roadblock. Inconsistent policies across state lines are also confusing and costly. Incentives and initiatives that count multiple ecosystem services at once may help to cover mitigation costs. For example, in California it might be feasible to combine GHG management opportunities with air- and water-related environmental policies. Ultimately we need engagement from industry and researchers to craft policy that meets both environmental and economic needs. Market limitations on biodigester products is one example of impediments to their widespread adoption. Policy can open up markets or provide other incentives that make mitigation strategies profitable for farmers and ranchers. Public policy can provide a guideline on development and approval of technology.

### ACTION TRACKS

<input type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 1: Ensure access to safe and nutritious food for all
<input type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 2: Shift to sustainable consumption patterns
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 3: Boost nature-positive production
<input type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 4: Advance equitable livelihoods
<input type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 5: Build resilience to vulnerabilities, shocks and stress

### KEYWORDS

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



## OUTCOMES FOR EACH DISCUSSION TOPIC - 3/3

The livestock sector will see increased innovation and deployment of various mitigation tools to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from beef and dairy cattle.

There are many powerful tools available to reduce methane emissions from livestock such as feed additives, manure management, and animal efficiency. While reducing enteric methane emissions is promising it is not the only strategy. In fact, reaching 50% methane reduction will be an uphill battle with feed additives as our only strategy. There is no silver bullet for farmers. We must look at the system as a whole and make reductions along the supply chain at every chance we have. If we zoom out and look at the whole system we can begin to identify inefficiencies. We then must communicate these efficiencies to the whole supply chain. More research to measure emissions from grazing systems and deeply understand methanogenesis in the rumen is needed. It cannot be on farmers and ranchers alone to achieve neutrality because they still have a bottom line and not all solutions can be adopted across all operations. If we can find a viable market for mitigation solutions farmers and ranchers will adopt them.

### ACTION TRACKS

<input type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 1: Ensure access to safe and nutritious food for all
<input type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 2: Shift to sustainable consumption patterns
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 3: Boost nature-positive production
<input type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 4: Advance equitable livelihoods
<input type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 5: Build resilience to vulnerabilities, shocks and stress

### KEYWORDS

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

## AREAS OF DIVERGENCE

Stakeholders whose interests should be prioritized are the farmers and ranchers, both large and small. A common theme in each of the discussions was it cannot be on farmers and ranchers alone to achieve neutrality because they still have a bottom line and not all solutions can be adopted across all operations, but the emissions from each type of operation can be mitigated.

### ACTION TRACKS

<input type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 1: Ensure access to safe and nutritious food for all
<input type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 2: Shift to sustainable consumption patterns
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 3: Boost nature-positive production
<input type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 4: Advance equitable livelihoods
<input type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 5: Build resilience to vulnerabilities, shocks and stress

### KEYWORDS

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

# ATTACHMENTS AND RELEVANT LINKS

---

## RELEVANT LINKS

- **Video: Roadmap to Climate Neutrality in the Beef and Dairy Sectors**  
<https://youtu.be/4gcaZ5Kk1Ww>