

# OFFICIAL FEEDBACK FORM

<b>DIALOGUE DATE</b>	Friday, 2 July 2021 10:00 GMT +10:00
<b>DIALOGUE TITLE</b>	The role of nutrition science in transforming to healthy and sustainable food systems
<b>CONVENED BY</b>	Ms Kim Anastasiou (Deakin University)
<b>DIALOGUE EVENT PAGE</b>	<a href="https://summitdialogues.org/dialogue/22642/">https://summitdialogues.org/dialogue/22642/</a>
<b>DIALOGUE TYPE</b>	Independent
<b>GEOGRAPHICAL FOCUS</b>	Australia

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

47

## PARTICIPATION BY AGE RANGE

0 0-18      8 19-30      24 31-50      13 51-65      2 66-80      0 80+

## PARTICIPATION BY GENDER

8 Male      39 Female      0 Prefer not to say or Other

## NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS IN EACH SECTOR

2	Agriculture/crops	7	Education	1	Health care
0	Fish and aquaculture	0	Communication	29	Nutrition
0	Livestock	0	Food processing	8	National or local government
0	Agro-forestry	0	Food retail, markets	0	Utilities
5	Environment and ecology	0	Food industry	0	Industrial
0	Trade and commerce	0	Financial Services	4	Other

## NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS FROM EACH STAKEHOLDER GROUP

1	Small/medium enterprise/artisan	0	Workers and trade union
0	Large national business	0	Member of Parliament
0	Multi-national corporation	0	Local authority
0	Small-scale farmer	13	Government and national institution
0	Medium-scale farmer	0	Regional economic community
0	Large-scale farmer	0	United Nations
4	Local Non-Governmental Organization	0	International financial institution
0	International Non-Governmental Organization	0	Private Foundation / Partnership / Alliance
0	Indigenous People	0	Consumer group
29	Science and academia	2	Other

## 2. PRINCIPLES OF ENGAGEMENT

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

All participants reviewed and agreed to the Principles of Engagement upon registration. Act with Urgency • The opening of the dialogue highlighted the goal of food system transformation by 2030. Commit to the Summit • Discussion groups were intentionally diverse and introduced participants who had not previously met to foster new connections. Be Respectful • Participants were encouraged to engage in the dialogue in a respectful manner. Recognize Complexity • Dialogue participants were invited to discuss how nutrition science can interact with other sciences and policy to ensure that the transformation of the food system happens in an integrated manner. • Discussion topics: o Food is more than the sum of nutrients and diets are more than the sum of the foods it contains. How can we capture a more holistic interpretation of nutrition science in the summit? o What are the challenges or barriers to informing food system change using nutrition science? o How can we avoid falling into the trap of aiming for more 'achievable' solutions within the dominant political paradigm, rather than aiming for transformative solutions that can bring about necessary changes for securing healthy and sustainable food systems? Embrace multi-stakeholder inclusivity • Participants were scientists (nutrition, environmental, agricultural), policy makers, & representatives from NGOs. • Discussion topics: o How does/ can nutrition science integrate with other disciplines to inform food system transformation? o What are the opportunities for increasing nutrition science engagement to reach the goal of a healthy and sustainable food system by 2030? o Who will need to be involved to achieve this vision? How can we work better with these stakeholders? Complement the work of others • Presenters discussed existing evidence and policies. • Discussions provided an opportunity to constructively critique existing pathways & suggest alternative solutions. Build Trust • Participants were encouraged to speak freely & the Chatham House Rules were explained.

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

Act with Urgency • Our first invited speaker highlighted the urgency of food system transformation for health and environment benefit. Commit to the Summit • A presenter highlighted the importance of the summit to provide an opportunity to make changes to the food system, through engaging stakeholders from a range of disciplines. Be Respectful • Participants were encouraged to engage in the dialogue in a respectful manner. Recognize Complexity • Opening presentations highlighted the complexity of the food system and the links between disciplines such as nutrition, environmental science, Indigenous rights, and food policy. • A speaker emphasised the importance of transformation, rather than minor tweaks in the food system, as transformation will be able to have impacts on more than just nutrition (i.e. social, commercial, political, environmental, and health impacts related to the food system). Embrace multi-stakeholder inclusivity • The speakers highlighted the importance of leaving no-one behind. Complement the work of others • A speaker discussed work in this field to date and noted that the concept of sustainable diets is not new. She explored the development of this area of science, and drew upon what has been learned to date, to enable the discussion of new ideas within the dialogue. Build Trust • The opening plenary speaker discussed the importance of building trust between actors, including conversations about values, having open minds, being transparent.

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

Ensure that participants are aware of the Principles upon registration.

# 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 focus of the dialogue was to explore the role of nutrition science in transforming food systems for health, equity and environmental sustainability. The rationale to this focus was that there are many technical and conceptual challenges in understanding how dietary patterns and foods are associated with health, equity and environmental sustainability. These challenges are exacerbated by the existence of competing worldviews about using evidence to inform food and nutrition policy activities. We sought to examine the role of nutrition science to contribute to global food system transformation in the context of the challenges and competing worldviews. This dialogue engaged Australian experts and leaders in nutrition science and policy as well as collaborators with expertise beyond nutrition science.

This dialogue is of importance because the 'game changing solutions' proposed as part of the UN Food Systems Summit need to be transformative to create a food system that is healthy, sustainable and equitable. Adjustments proposed to date, such as reformulation or food labelling schemes, will be insufficient to make the necessary changes to transform the food system, and have limited opportunity to address food system outcomes beyond nutrition. Actions proposed as part of the summit process also need to be evidence-based.

Thus, this dialogue was focused on how nutrition science can be leveraged to address systemic issues and transform the food system.

### 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

This dialogue focused on the role of nutrition science in food system transformation. Participants felt that the food system presented challenges but also presented opportunities for meaningful change. However, sectors need to be aligned in their vision and understanding of the required changes. Leaders in food system change need to consider whether actions are adjustments, reformative or transformative.

Five key recommendations came from the discussion groups. They are outlined below.

1. Develop a consistent understanding of terms and goals (e.g. food system; nutrition science; nutrition principles, goals of food system transformation) and clearly articulate them.

- Human rights should be the centre of all discussions and an equitable food system is the goal.
- The shared vision of a food system needs to encompass health, equity and environmental sustainability. This vision should also acknowledge that radical transformation may not be comfortable, and not all will win.
- All sectors of the food system need to understand the definitions and goals of food systems, and they need to be owned by everyone. Outcomes will suffer if there is not a shared vision.
- A better vision is needed for Australian agriculture as we are currently not 'nutrition secure' (see topic 4, below).
- Nutrition science should include foods, dietary patterns and be aligned with broader frameworks such as ecological nutrition, rather than just focusing on nutrient composition.

2. Consider the types of evidence used to inform policies and food system transformation

- Policy actions that focus on nutrients, foods, and diets need to be aligned and considered within a much broader food system framework that includes ecology and sustainability.
- The 'hierarchy of evidence' used in policy decisions to rank the types of evidence needs to be reconsidered. For example, remove parts of the hierarchy of evidence that are only relevant to clinical studies so that it is more relevant to food systems. We also need to think about who the current hierarchy benefits e.g. food industry may benefit from emphasis on clinical trials, which may not have benefits for public health.
- Consider how we frame and assess evidence, and subsequently incorporate this into nutrition policies and guidelines needs to be further analysed. Approaches used need to be fit-for-purpose and enable the inclusion of sustainability messages and equity.
- Nutrition policies need to be more closely aligned and embedded in other sectoral policies, e.g. agricultural policies.

3. Foster inclusion in food system debates and policies

- Consider how the debates can shift to focus less on the global north.
- Marginalized groups, farmers and primary producers deserve greater recognition at the policy table and global dialogues.
- Practitioners and researchers need to communicate and work together more.
- Evidence and stories from different sectors need to be combined to create change.
- The nutrition discipline needs to encompass and be more informed by other sectors in the food system, e.g. agriculture.
- Transformation in the food system is also political and social. Thus, food system transformation requires strong engagement from all sectors, including civil society and respectful inclusion of Indigenous knowledges. Similarly, nutrition science is multidisciplinary and in order to make change, nutrition scientists need to incorporate all of these elements.

4. Address power dynamics in the food system

- Power and political determinants must become more prominent in discussions of addressing the food system. Very few events and reports are up-front about how the food system has evolved in the context of corporate power, and thus we fail to hold corporations accountable and truly address the harms associated with industrial food production.

5. Solutions must be systems-conscious

- The food industry works in an integrated way, and so must be regulated in a globally coordinated fashion to protect health and the environment.
- NOVA can be a helpful tool for us to regulate food industry because it encapsulates not just technical or reductionist components but is inherently conscious of social drivers and holistic dietary patterns.
- Utilising multinational organisations to work with industry and utilising some of their power may be a way forward – so that governments and advocates for sustainability and health are better united. Including the voice of the consumer at the forefront may help.
- Technical solutions could disincentivise the creation and implementation of more holistic/ transformative solutions. But pushing for transformative change may lead to silver bullet solutions, and transformative change is not necessarily how change happens in reality.

## 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 - 1/6

Topic 1: Public health nutrition science and principles are essential to underpin evidence-informed decision-making for transforming food systems to be healthy, equitable and sustainable by 2030.

### Integrating nutrition science & food systems

Nutrition issues are relevant to dietary, socioeconomic, and ecological elements of the food system. Understanding the political and social context that created our present food system will help us make progress. A framework for transition, including a clear vision for food system transformation is vital.

Nutrition scientists need to be aware of the impact of their work on the broader system. It is important that healthy and sustainable diets are not assumed to have 'one size fits all' solutions.

Nutrition science is not being used to optimum effect to guide food system transformation because certain interests (e.g. big agriculture) trump nutrition & health narratives, particularly in countries like Australia which prioritise production of certain foods & exports.

To overcome the barriers such as the "business as usual approach", "policy inertia" and "resistance in government", decision makers need to better manage those challenging changes (which mainly are coming from the 'big food' industry) and trade-offs. Some participants felt unable to make meaningful change at the policy level, because policies are heavily influenced by industry. Food policies which stem from a governing body, such as the UN, are able to unite governments to appropriately regulate industry and subsequently are essential for transformation.

### Integrating policy & practice

There is a disconnect between conversations in practice and academia. E.g. in practice the focus is on promoting the consumption of healthy foods, but in academia there is a focus on reducing unhealthy foods. We need more conversations between people working in different sectors, and academics need to consider how to support practitioners. E.g. researchers should ask practitioners about problems & research questions. We need to bring together evidence and stories to promote change. Researchers need more funding to promote healthy foods, rather than focusing so much on reducing unhealthy foods.

### Definitions and evidence for policy

The UN FSS needs to find a consensus on nutrition science definitions and what types of evidence are suitable to inform policy. There are strong concerns that if not done, important evidence may be continued to be pushed aside in policy making. An example of ensuring that definitions capture the right scope in policies was that nations should create National 'Food System' Policies rather than a National 'Nutrition' Policies. Another suggestion was to use the term 'Ecological Nutrition' rather than 'Nutrition Science'. These types of definitions can lead to constructive dialogues and multi-sectorial collaboration. Evidence which informs food system transformation needs to be considered. Participants felt that the UN FSS appears to be approaching science from a western approach, which favours high-income countries. Science is only one form of knowledge, we also need to think about the broader principles e.g. ecology, human rights, inclusion. Additionally, the evidence hierarchy used in Australia prioritises research from clinical trials over other evidence, including traditional Indigenous knowledge. We need to consider who benefits from this e.g. dietary supplement manufacturers may benefit from clinical trials. Food systems research may benefit from removing the parts of the evidence hierarchy which are only relevant to clinical studies. This may foster the inclusion of environmental sustainability in dietary guideline development.

We need to consider the level of granularity of research used as evidence for policy. E.g. foods and dietary patterns are more aligned with food system change, but we don't want to reject evidence about specific nutrients. Nutrient approaches are also important e.g. when analysing nutrient content of traditional foods to promote biodiversity. We need alignment between policies focusing on nutrients, foods, and diets. We need integration of approaches, and to keep focusing on the big picture.

### 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 - 2/6

Topic 2: Food is more than the sum of nutrients and diets are more than the sum of the foods it contains. How can we capture a more holistic interpretation of nutrition science in the summit?

Participants felt that the definition of nutrition science and having clear goals for food system transformation was important. Policy action is based on the goals and definitions of nutrition science. In order to make holistic and systemic changes we need to agree on a more holistic vision for nutrition science and food system transformation. We need to identify the people who have agency to come in and endorse definitions. There is a disconnect between food technology, agriculture and nutrition at universities and it is preventing us having a holistic vision for the future. Definitions and goals need to be owned by everyone, including the people themselves. Young people need buy-in because they are very motivated to improve the food system. When we use narrow definitions, it is easy to split people. In terms of nutrition science and nutrition-related food system goals, the idea of nourishment instead of nutrients may be more palatable. The first step here is to get people on the same page with concepts.

Participants discussed that nutrition science originally looked at what is on a person's plate, but we need to expand the scope of this science to encompass where food comes from including production and source. A person from a non-nutrition science background noted that the supply chain was crucial to finding a more holistic interpretation and bringing people together. They felt that from an agriculture perspective, people focus on the raw food product, but what happens in the supply chain after that is connected to bigger things. The more holistic interpretation of nutrition needs to acknowledge how the food supply chain impacts the processing of food.

Some participants expressed concern about promoting plant-based diets, without consideration of land clearing, water consumption, soil depletion relating to agricultural production. A more holistic definition of nutrition science may be able to account for these environmental concerns. The influence of food culture on food systems also needs to be considered and incorporated in the definition of nutrition science.

### 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 - 3/6

Topic 3: How does/ can nutrition science integrate with other disciplines to inform food system transformation? (1,877/ 4200 characters)

Participants discussed the reductive nature of much of nutrition science. For example, considering nutrients without the context of foods, and considering foods without the context of diets was considered to be reductive. Analysis of nutrients is much easier and can be used in clinical trials, but scientists need to consider the complex interactions with other food and dietary components.

Life cycle assessments (an environmental measurement technique) are also very reductive – they often narrowly define the scope of study in environmental science. So, it is difficult to use these reductive nutrition and environmental techniques together because they have limited the scope for studies. The NOVA classification system (used for classifying foods into the level of processing) can be a bridge here – because if you look at it as a technical classification system, then it is reductive. But if you look at the categories, they're already socialised (able to consider the social and political determinants of the system). The definition of these categories is looking at the PURPOSE of processing. The ultra-processed category, for example, is a type of food produced by the food industry – so it's already socialised. It connects food and its broader components to other issues. Participants felt that science should no longer separate biological sciences from the social sciences, and that the NOVA classification would help.

One group discussed concerns about science being misused. They discussed that processed foods are sometimes greenwashed, but it is better (healthier, more sustainable) to use foods in their raw form. For example, 'Beyond Meat' burgers have a higher environmental impact than legumes, and their impacts lie between red meat and pork. The participants felt that these temporary solutions may prevent the development of more holistic/ transformative systemic solutions.

### ACTION TRACKS

<input type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 1: Ensure access to safe and nutritious food for all
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 2: Shift to sustainable consumption patterns
<input 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 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 - 4/6

Topic 4: Is nutrition science currently being used to optimum effect to guide food system transformation? Why/ why not? (3,621/ 4200 characters)

Participants noted that public health nutrition is not resulting in the changes that we need to see. Perhaps nutrition science could be used in a better way, that doesn't focus on reductionism. E.g. the health star rating is being championed in Australia as a way to transform the food system, but this system is suboptimal. While reformulation can have public health benefits, it can also allow other foods to be determined as healthy and may distract policy makers from solutions which have bigger impacts.

Participants discussed the process of guideline creation in Australia. Some participants felt these guidelines were based on evidence and were transparent, while others had concerns about power dynamics and undue influence. More specifically, Australian recommendations require evidence and an overview of the process is always provided and feedback is transparent. However, others felt that power in the food system was more problematic and less manageable and measurable. A participant noted that the food industry is regularly meeting with elected officials, and the industry has a lot of power and influence over policy.

One group discussed the global nature of the food system and how large corporations are unable to be regulated by one country alone. This group noted that there is a mismatch between the food production system (global) and food regulation (national). While developing global regulation and international law is politically challenging, global proposals about how the corporations should be regulated and integrated policies across countries could help balance the playing field between corporations and health. This would require a lot of effort, but bodies like the UN have the opportunity to lead policies which are integrated across countries. This could also enable more protection of public health and the environment. We also need to rally consumers and other stakeholders and choose our fights wisely. The NOVA classification may also help here, as we can argue that ultra-processed foods are unnecessary for all.

A different discussion group felt that nutrition science is being used as a tool to market and make products that are not the best ones for the planet or people's health. Nutrition science used for marketing and the industry directs the research to some extent, particularly in relation to processed foods. Thus, nutrition science is being used in a way that many scientists do not want. On the other hand, some noted that progress is good – in the last decade agriculture has been better at nutrition-sensitive agriculture. But the nutrition discipline needs to be more informed by the other sectors, i.e. we need a multi-sectoral focus.

Participants also discussed the difference between transformation and incremental change, noting that the world usually works in an evolutionary/ incremental manner. Participants noted that the pandemic has opened a moment in time where consumer citizens, governments, retailers are aware of the fragility of the food supply chain so there is currently an opportunity to act with this awareness. They discussed that the Australian government is dependent on an export food supply chain, particularly for specific commodities such as fruit and vegetables (we import 10-20%). Thus, despite being presented as food secure, Australia is not 'nutrition secure' because we are dependent on imports to meet nutritional requirements. When considering types of imported foods, we should consider if the foods can be substituted for Australian-grown products and if dietary adequacy be fine without imports. We also need to consider repercussions if these foods were removed.

### 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 - 5/6

Topic 5: What are the opportunities for increasing engagement with nutrition science to reach the goal of a healthy and sustainable food system by 2030, and who will need to be involved to achieve this vision? (Up to 4200 characters)

Participants felt that the first step was to ensure that the vision of the food system is well-established. It is difficult to align stakeholders if they are working without knowing what the goal is. Participants felt that equity and human rights should be the priority in all decisions and policy approaches before solutions to food system problems are decided. Bringing marginalized groups and people that experience disadvantage into the discussion is imperative. The UN FSS and other global dialogues must make efforts to actively engage all people in decision making in a transparent manner.

Some participants felt that the nutrition science community should be enabling transformative change, and discussed relationships needed for this. They felt that the farming community needs a more prominent role as they can inform what works economically and in a production sense. The primary producing industry in general should be engaged as part of the conversation, as quite often they will have a lot to say and they need to be on board for transformative change to occur. Building a sustainable bridge between nutrition science and agriculture sector to achieve sustainable production systems (agroecology, regenerative agriculture) is vital to transform food systems. There are active and transformative things happening in agriculture right now, however they are only on a small scale and they need to be scaled up. There is a movement there to be built upon for change.

Those who understand how to regenerate and rehydrate degraded land (through regenerative agriculture, agroecology etc) should have a greater position in the transformation debate. They tend not to be part of discussion, but they can tell us succinctly about what is economically possible and what is not possible, although there are many sectors that influence the economics in food systems. Also, a greater emphasis should be placed on growing crops/livestock that are suitable for specific environments and specific contexts.

One group discussed that the revision of the Australian Dietary Guidelines is a good opportunity for change in Australia. This will showcase how we integrate with the other disciplines. In Australia, the issue of how industry is involved in dietary guidelines is an issue. We also need to consider how we ensure sustainability is embedded, which may or may not be helped/ hindered by industry (participants felt differently about this). Getting consumers interested and engaged with embedding sustainability in the dietary guidelines could help, particularly engaging with young people. Participants discussing the Australian Dietary Guidelines felt that they are the biggest and most immediate opportunity. Since the last guidelines, there is much more evidence for sustainability. Additionally, there is a lot of opportunity to advocate for all sectors to contribute to the guidelines. While concepts and principles direct guidelines development, much of the work remains political. If we can work together, advocate strongly and support the dietary guideline committee in decision making, this could be a big opportunity for change.

The next steps are not about starting conversations about food systems and environmental sustainability, but rather building on existing conversations. Effective communication is needed to build inclusivity across the food system.

### ACTION TRACKS

<input type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 1: Ensure access to safe and nutritious food for all
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 2: Shift to sustainable consumption patterns
<input 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 checked="" 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 - 6/6

Topic 6: What paradigm shifts are required to achieve a healthy, equitable and environmentally sustainable food system? (2568/ 4200 characters)

Participants noted that the current decisions in the food system are driven by the 'global north' and powerful actors throughout the food system. If a global centric approach is not adopted, the dynamics needed to create transformative change won't work at scale. Dialogues need to be a truly participatory process and foster inclusive conversations. It can be challenging to move forward together with multiple stakeholders when stakeholders have different objectives. With regards to the Australian Dietary Guidelines, there needs to be some vision from the outset about what the key outcomes are, and everyone's ideas should be on the table. The current global opportunities are important for us to start talking about bigger change and larger opportunities, without settling for the status quo. Equity in the system is essential.

There is a great concern that industry involvement is distorting the agenda and several comments and concerns were raised that the dialogues in the UN FSS were favouring some countries and regions over others. Sometimes the issue isn't about the content or the details, it's about the connections. In the absence of having some sort of joined up national policy for these discussions, the talk will continue to be about discrete projects. We need to think more about the dynamics to make connected changes happen. Some participants felt that there needs to be a greater emphasis on decision making processes result in transformative changes to current food system activities. However, participants in another group noted that transformative change may push us towards silver bullet solutions. Some simple solutions like eating more legumes are very powerful.

Areas around the world are different and a one size fits all in sustainable production doesn't work so nutrition science needs to play a bigger role in mapping out how production systems are managed so evidence is informing decisions. We need a global framework for managing trade-offs between economic, social, political factors in food system transformations.

Connections are paramount, between and within sectors. Conversations need to build the bridge between nutrition science and regenerative agriculture. We must consider that many parts of the planet cannot ecologically produce foods suggested for sustainable healthy diets and plans need to be global for production to be equitable.

Shifting the current mantra about lowering food prices to instead focus on labour contributions for food and home production could be an opportunity.

### 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

There was broad agreement about the challenges and opportunities that exist, despite the diversity of participants. In one discussion group, there was some disagreement about what exactly 'nutrition science' means, and what having 'nutrition principles' underpinning the food systems transformation even means. For some, they felt that nutrition principles already encompassed wider social/environmental concerns, in addition to health. Others felt that most people did not have a good understanding of the functions of the food system and the role of power, and that current principles underpinning the UN FSS did not sufficiently encompass these elements.

Some participants felt that food systems should focus on transformative actions, whereas others felt that technical or incremental change would be more effective.

One discussion group also experienced a disagreement about how evidence can be used to inform policy. Some felt that guidelines were transparent but could benefit from better communication and making sure that people were consistent with their use of evidence. Others felt that that was a mischaracterisation of how policy is really made, and that science and evidence is not made in a vacuum. These participants felt that human behaviour and relationships can not necessarily be measured, and these are huge factors in influencing policy. A different group was also conflicted on the extent to which food-based dietary guidelines are influenced by industry, and how challenging it is likely to be to include sustainability messages in the next iteration of guidelines.

### 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

- **Dialogue Flyer and Speaker Details**  
<https://summitdialogues.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/IPAN-UNFSS-Flyer.pdf>

## RELEVANT LINKS

- **Deakin University Institute for Physical Activity and Nutrition Website**  
<https://www.deakin.edu.au/ipan>