

# OFFICIAL FEEDBACK FORM

<b>DIALOGUE DATE</b>	Friday, 11 June 2021 10:30 GMT +05:45
<b>DIALOGUE TITLE</b>	"Nepal towards an equitable, resilient and sustainable food system"
<b>CONVENED BY</b>	Hon. Dr. Krishna Prasad Oli, Member, National Planning Commission
<b>DIALOGUE EVENT PAGE</b>	<a href="https://summitdialogues.org/dialogue/24198/">https://summitdialogues.org/dialogue/24198/</a>
<b>DIALOGUE TYPE</b>	Member State
<b>GEOGRAPHICAL FOCUS</b>	Nepal

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

1 0-18      14 19-30      98 31-50      62 51-65      6 66-80      80+

### PARTICIPATION BY GENDER

132 Male      48 Female      1 Prefer not to say or Other

### NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS IN EACH SECTOR

70	Agriculture/crops	6	Education	2	Health care
2	Fish and aquaculture	4	Communication	23	Nutrition
6	Livestock	5	Food processing	12	National or local government
3	Agro-forestry		Food retail, markets		Utilities
9	Environment and ecology		Food industry	1	Industrial
	Trade and commerce		Financial Services	38	Other

### NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS FROM EACH STAKEHOLDER GROUP

9	Small/medium enterprise/artisan	0	Workers and trade union
	Large national business		Member of Parliament
3	Multi-national corporation		Local authority
4	Small-scale farmer	47	Government and national institution
	Medium-scale farmer	1	Regional economic community
	Large-scale farmer	51	United Nations
21	Local Non-Governmental Organization	1	International financial institution
13	International Non-Governmental Organization	1	Private Foundation / Partnership / Alliance
	Indigenous People		Consumer group
12	Science and academia	18	Other

## 2. PRINCIPLES OF ENGAGEMENT

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

List of participants for the first national food system dialogues was prepared and shared among the stakeholders to get inputs to ensure representation of diverse participation in terms of sector and disciplines, ethnicity and gender. Series of revisions and addition were made to ensure inclusive participation. The national dialogue has provided opportunities to engage participants from different stakeholder groups representing Government, academia, research, farmers' organization, civil societies and private sector organizations from different regions and parts of the country.

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

As we know, Food System is complex and need to have deeper level of analysis that requires to set the background for the comprehensive understanding and analysis. For that, systematic approach and procedures were followed. This was also helpful to ensure active engagement of the stakeholder. An organizing committee was formed representing key stakeholders to steer the overall process and technical committee to support technically. Further six Working Groups were also formed to work on specific action tracks and policy environments. In order to have the consistent process and to facilitate the dialogues effectively, series to orientations were organized to the facilitators and curator of the event. These orientations were locally adapted in the context based on the original contents of the Curator and Facilitators training organized by UN Food System Secretariat. All the sessions were led by government and supported by experts and key stakeholders in order to ensure ownership of outcomes and future commitments for the proposed actions for transforming the food system. During the dialogue, critical analysis of the national Food Systems was done to examine in terms of their potential causes/barriers, drivers and actions for the next 3 years. Participant stakeholders were actively engaged in different group discussion to interact, exchange and share ideas and actions respectfully for analyzing and improving Nepalese food system. In order to have a meaningful dialogues among the participants and have a basic level of understanding on food system, UN Food System Summit, key issues related to food systems and national dialogue process among the participants, a participants brief was prepared and share before the event. Further, Nepali languages was used in the event to have active engagement of participants in the dialogues; and a provision of simultaneous interpretation in English was made for the non-Nepali speakers.

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

Further efforts have to put to increase participation of private sectors in the dialogues.

# 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

Government of Nepal, National Planning Commission (NPC), organized the first National Food Systems Dialogue on 11th June 2011 on the theme Nepal towards an equitable, resilient and sustainable food system under the Chair of Honorable Dr Krishna Prasad Oli, Member, NPC and National Dialogue Convenor. Hon. Dr. Oli delivered welcome speech and opening remarks. He stressed on the need for collective efforts from all the sectors in the process to transform food system and contribute to achieve all SDGs.

Major focus of the dialogue was to engage stakeholders for a comprehensive exploration of food systems in Nepal as part of the process for the UN Food Systems Summit 2021. The specific objectives of the dialogue were to;

- raise awareness and promote public discussion on the food systems,
- examine current situation and identify key aspects of Nepalese food systems, such as the drivers, actions, pathways, and
- explore opportunities for food system to make it equitable, sustainable and resilient.

A total of 180 participants attended the event representing different stakeholder groups, background, institutions, and professions.

In order to generate focused dialogues and collect the specific inputs, participants were assigned to respective Action Track (AT) Groups after a brief opening session in the plenary.

Dr Yogendra Kumar Karki, Secretary, Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock Development (MoALD) and Curator for National Food System Dialogue curated the dialogues. The AT coordinators, facilitators, co-facilitators, and rapporteurs facilitated the dialogue process.

Each AT Group had proposition and reference questions to engage in dialogue and provide inputs as follows:

AT 1 Proposition: Increased agriculture productivity and develop sustainable food chain for affordable safe, healthy, and nutritious diet to improve levels of nutrition, ensure all people to be well nourished and healthy and achieve zero hunger.

AT2 Proposition: Enabling, inspiring and motivating people to enjoy healthy and sustainable consumption options; Slashing food loss and waste; and transitioning to a circular economy through advancing in technological, environmental, economic, social, regulatory, and institutional fronts.

AT3 Proposition: Protect natural ecosystems from new deforestation and conversion for food and feed production; manage sustainably existing food production systems; restore degraded ecosystems and rehabilitate soil function for sustainable food production.

AT4 Proposition: Developing inclusive and diverse food systems that contribute to the elimination of poverty and food and nutrition insecurity by creating jobs, raising incomes across food value chains; protecting and enhancing cultural and social capital; reducing risks for the poorest and increasing value distribution.

AT5 Proposition: Developing inclusive and equitable food systems to ensure that all people within a food system are empowered to prepare for, withstand, and recover from instability and participate in a food system that, despite shocks and stressors, delivers food security, nutrition, and equitable livelihoods for all.

AT6: Referring to the overarching legal document developed based on the constitutional provision, Right to Food and Food Sovereignty Act (2018), is considered as a legal framework. Hence, this Act and related policies are the key to strengthen food system governance and accountability and transform food system that is resilient, equitable and sustainable.

Dialogue reference questions: Following 5 questions were presented to the participants to facilitate the dialogue:

1. What are the underlying causes/ barriers for achieving the stated proposition?
2. What are the key drivers of unsustainable food system?
3. What actions in the next 3 years will have greatest impact on the Discussion Topic?
4. How will it be possible to tell if these actions are being successful?
5. What are the role and responsibilities of the food system actors including those of the federal, provincial, and local Governments in sustainable food system transformation in Nepal?

## 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

The national dialogue provided opportunity to engage participants from different agencies, sectors, and disciplines including the government, academia, researcher, farmers' organization, civil societies and private sectors from different parts of the country. During the dialogue, critical discussions were held to examine the national food systems to understand potential causes/barriers and drivers and generate ideas to decide bold actions for the next 3 years. Indeed, this will be further verified and refined after the feedback from the Provincial, and second and third national dialogues.

The dialogue also collected some learning to reflect impression and work further on as following:

1. Some participants were new to virtual meetings (attending the session using online platform to participate in specific groups);
2. Few participants showed up from industries and value chains (actors).
3. The issues were well understood by the participants, which were common for some of the ATs, like AT 1 and 2; AT 3 and 5; AT 4 and 6 in the context of Nepal. Drivers of change and actions mentioned were also common to some tracks.
4. There was a common understanding among the working groups about the role and responsibilities of the three spheres of the government in Nepal, in terms of formulating policies, regulations, education, and their implementation. Participants have suggested to draw clear delineation of the roles and responsibilities of the three spheres of government.
5. There was strong commitment from NPC and MoALD and Development Partners to address the issues through policies and programmes. However, participants raised concern for the same level of commitments from other public agencies, like Ministry of Health and Population (MOHP), Ministry of Forestry and Environment (MoFE), Ministry of Industry, Commerce and Supply (MolCS) to address the issues of access to food, nutrition, distribution and effective implementation of policies and regulations.
6. Some gaps were experienced with regard to the representation from some value chain actors like processors, industrialists, transporters, wholesalers/retailers, working in different parts of the country. There is need of some additional efforts to have their participation during the provincial and local level dialogues.

Overall, participants had actively engaged in different groups to exchange and share ideas and potential actions for analyzing and improving the Nepalese food systems. Some potential and emerging issues were identified and validated; the dialogue was also helpful in raising awareness and elevating public discussion on key food system issues and identify potential options and solutions for making food system inclusive, resilient and sustainable (refer Section C below).

Five Action Tracks and one cross cutting lever of change were the Discussion Topics. Following the constitutional provision, cross cutting lever of change was selected as the Right to Food and Food Sovereignty Act as a legal framework for the sustainable food system in Nepal. Hence, six groups rigorously discussed on these topics following the ATs propositions and reference questions mentioned in Section A above. Relevant Joint Secretaries of the Government of Nepal had chaired the groups, while the thematic experts from the government and non-government sectors had facilitated the discussions, and designated rapporteurs from different agencies had documented the discussion points. Whole exercise was concluded with big team efforts.

Since the participants of the Discussion Topics expressed very similar opinions on the reference questions on possible ways to tell, if these actions are being successful; and the roles and responsibilities of the three spheres of governments (federal, provincial, and local governments), the discussion outcomes are summarized accordingly and presented at the end.

### 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

### Discussion Topic AT 1: Ensure safe and nutritious food for all

Context: cereal grain availability is fluctuating due to variations in production; per capita availability has reached from 194 Kg (2001/02) to 237 Kg (2017/18); 48.2% households are food secure, whereas 10% are severely food insecure. Percentage of severely food insecure households are more in rural areas (11.7%) than in urban (8.8%), the percentage is highest in Karnali Province (17.5%) followed by Sudurpaschim (13%) and Province-2 (10.7%). Situation of nutrition has improved over the period of 1996 to 2019: stunting decreased from 57 to 32%, underweight 42 to 24, and wasting from 15 to 12%.

Underlying causes affecting the stated proposition: locally available nutritious crops/foods getting less importance; biodiversity/cultural diversity not promoted. No focus on micronutrients; poor nutrition including breastfeeding and complementary feeding practices; many families do not have access to nutrient rich foods; growing burden of non-communicable diseases; divergence between nutrition and WASH programmes due to lack of coherence between food security and nutrition sectors.

Drivers of change: low crop productivity; high losses (pre and post-harvest); inadequate road connectivity, and storage facilities. Loss of biodiversity; poor food diversity; low education and awareness level on the nutritive value of underutilized crops; preference to the readymade/ultra-processed foods. High cost of nutritious food. Poor food safety and hygiene conditions; dominance of brokers/middleperson in agricultural productions. Less access of farm households to technology, recurrent disaster events threatening agriculture system; increased risk to investors and farmers; land fragmentation and unscientific land use; youth migration from rural areas leaving fallow land behind.

Actions in next 3 years for greater impact: promote home gardens for nutritious foods; employment creation to increase income of the poor; scale up social protection programmes and food fortification. Address double/triple burden of malnutrition; create awareness among the women about the value of food. All season road and connectivity to reduce food insecurity in remote areas. Educate people to consume homegrown foods through advocacy and awareness programmes, and school education. Promote local food production and develop distribution network; reduce long food chains from farm to fork. Increase on farm productivity by adopting sustainable practices; develop varieties, use bio fortified varieties of crops (essential micro-n). Improve agri-input and market systems (access and cost); enhance capacity of local researchers and scientist; increase dietary diversity and value addition. Capacity building of groups: women, cooperatives, users' groups, etc. Integrate crops-vegetables with aquaculture for small-scale farmers; production diversity for livestock products. Reduce post-harvest losses (quantity and nutrient loss); awareness raising and education for breast feeding; education to remote consumers about the nutritive value of local foods and promote production diversification. Adopt food-systems approach for enhanced diets and nutrition, income and resilience. Promote nutrient rich food availability, consumption, and quality assurance. Taxation on less nutritious food. Target fresh food markets as a critical entry point for improving food safety and focus on investments in infrastructure and sanitation; consumer education for diet quality and food safety.

Options to assess the actions being successful:

Result monitoring and evaluation framework in place for all actions; agreement between/among the governments with clear roles and responsibility; education and awareness raising in mass scale.

Collaboration/Partnership: Develop strong linkages among the governments; develop integrated information system; better communication on safe and nutritious local food and cost; address markets and distribution issues at local levels; development of linkages: agro-tourism-nutrition, agro-forestry-foods-nutrition.

### 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 - 2/6

Discussion Topic AT2: Shift to sustainable consumption patterns.

Context: About 4.6 million people are food insecure; triple burden of malnutrition-under nutrition, overweight/ obesity, and micronutrient deficiency. Stunting, wasting and low weight in children contributing to 52 percent of child mortality; obesity among children and adolescents has increased by 29 times in the past four decades; women and children also suffer from some of the world's highest levels of vitamin and mineral deficiencies.

Underlying causes for achieving the stated proposition: change in dietary pattern characterized by two-meal-rice (per capita rice consumption increased by nearly 70% in 50 years). Dietary shift towards unhealthy processed foods high in saturated and trans-fat, salt and sugar neglecting nutritious indigenous crop-based foods. Increase in fat intake in diet and undernutrition in childhood has coincided with increased overweight/ obesity and other Non-Communicable Diseases (NCD); over two-thirds of adolescent girls in both rural and urban areas reported consuming sugary foods. Consumption of foods produced by using high dose chemical fertilizers and pesticides; items, such as biscuits, instant noodles and juice drinks may be supplying about a quarter of energy intake of children <2 years, which is lowering their intake of essential vitamins and minerals.

Drivers of change: low level of consumer awareness about the healthy food habit and choice of nutritious foods; high cost of nutritious diet (nutritious diet is costlier by 242% than the energy only diet); urbanization and rapid proliferation of fast food culture. Weak market regulation for unhealthy and adulterated food products. Lack of legislation on labelling of nutritive value of food; no availability of essential nutrition package for different age groups; social, religious, and cultural aspects of food consumption behaviors. Government subsidies on food commodities in the form of social protection are not aligned with dietary guideline. Inflated advertisement of food. Many businesses are producing ultra-processed food items. Less awareness on food loss and waste among the actors across the food chain. No policy to reduce salt/sodium consumption, limit saturated fatty acid intake, eliminate industrially produced trans fatty acids, reduce the impact of marketing of foods and beverages high in saturated fats, trans fatty acids, free sugars, or salt on children. Proliferation of modern lifestyle, copying from others; poor knowledge about nutritious food and source of nutritious food at various service points-schools, community, and family.

Actions in next 3 years for greater impact: analyze existing food consumption pattern and prepare national framework for sustainable food consumption. Increase investment in agricultural sector; policy framework for sustainable consumption pattern, link mid-day school meal to the homegrown foods. Prepare menu using local food, at least, twice a week by the government officials working in remote communities. Food Management and Trading Company to initiate Fair Price Shop in food insecure areas; food fortification and supply to vulnerable groups. Provision of subsidy and incentives for farmers to sustainable food production system; implement land use policy; upgrade national food based dietary guideline. Investment in infrastructure development; develop national policy for food waste management.

Options to assess the actions being successful: Develop result frameworks and result- based accountability matrix for 3 spheres of governments. Federal government to develop policy, Provincial to infrastructure and monitoring, and create linkage and capacity development of local levels; local government to provide incentive package to the farmers and other actors.

Collaboration/Partnership: Federal government should focus on developing capacity of local govt. and infrastructure development at provincial level; Province government should play role in monitoring, and promoting local farmers and local governments on mobilization of resources; local government should promote and incentivize nutrient-dense local food production and consumption.

### 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

### Discussion Topic AT3: Boost nature-positive food production at scale

Context: Increased biodiversity losses, deforestation, land degradation. One third of agricultural lands are fallow and degraded, and a large portion are converted to settlements and infrastructure. Production of major staples and commercial vegetables in some pockets has caused excessive mining of soil nutrients, water depletion and agrochemical pollution. Food habits mostly towards rice and wheat have led to a narrow dietary diversity; this has resulted in loss of traditional crops and indigenous knowledge.

Underlying barriers for achieving the stated proposition: Dependency on imported crop varieties is increasing with lack of site-specific food production; lack of production in broader landscape/agroecosystem level. Lack of land use policy and plans have promoted rapid conversion of fertile agriculture lands into settlements and other non-agriculture use. Disappearance of indigenous food system; rural out-migration; inadequate capacity development of farmers; lack of agriculture mechanization.

#### Drivers of change:

1. Climate change impact: Climate induced disasters (flood, drought, extreme rainfalls, and disease and pest outbreaks) have negatively affected productions. Rise in temperature has made possible to cultivate some lowland crops in higher altitudes.
2. Socioeconomic change: Youth out-migration, change in food habits (food culture) and urbanization have created fallow land and shortage of agricultural workforces affecting eco-friendly food production.
3. Land degradation: conversion of productive agricultural land into infrastructure development and unscientific cultivation in the hilly terraces. Continuous cropping of narrow diversity of staples and modern varieties without legume rotation in Terai (plains) resulting in decline of soil fertility.
4. Weak governance: weak agricultural research and extension organizations (like NARC, DoA and AKC), and their weak coordination among 3 spheres of government. Lack of effective communication between NARC, AKCs and local agri-extension have constrained in the flow of adequate knowledge and information

Actions in next 3 years for greater impact: investment on food-water-energy-biodiversity-health nexus, R&D on agroecosystem. Revitalization of indigenous food system; land utilization based on Land Use Act and Land Use Policy. Value chain of local crops based on comparative advantage, focus on quality seed, organic production and quality assurance services. Improvement of food governance and policy coherence. Assurance of market and irrigation; implementation of climate change national adaptation plan (NAP) and local adaption plan of action (LAPA). Development of evidence-based policy. Invest in agriculture research recognizing the value of local food system research.

Options to assess the actions being successful: Political will on reducing land degradation; monitoring to oversee implementation of land bank, land use plans; minimum support price of production with buy back guarantee; fair price shops established; agriculture and livestock insurance policy in place; climate services to farmers through early warning and preparedness. Implementation of food and nutrition security and ecosystem policies.

Collaboration/Partnership: Following are the specific roles and responsibilities of the governments at 3 spheres: Federal Government: national policy for natural resource management and agrobiodiversity; climate act to reduce GHGs emission; strengthen NARC as autonomous institution for providing support to all governments to develop and promote green agricultural technologies for nature positive production system.

Provincial and Local Government: strengthened Agricultural Extensions- through Private- public partnership following Agriculture Development Strategy; strengthen Agricultural Knowledge Centers to focus on technical services.

Implementation of LAPA; documentation and registration of native agrobiodiversity and natural resources; link production systems with agro-ecotourism and health for nature positive production systems.

#### 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 - 4/6

### Discussion Topic AT4: Advance equitable livelihoods of people involved in food systems

Context: landless, smallholders, women, Dalits, indigenous people rely on agriculture and forest-based foods; many of them are unrecognized as farmers, underpaid and, or wage rates differ by gender. Inadequate institutional mechanisms for and limited capacity of women, small holders, old-age, people with disability (PWD), they have less access to production resources, space for voice, negotiation power in the market systems. State of food and nutrition security varies by provinces, ecological belts and gender. These groups are disproportionately affected during any kinds of shocks and emergencies.

Underlying causes for achieving the stated proposition: agriculture sector is seen as less remunerative and less attractive. The skewed power relation over productive resources especially of land, water, forest to women and disadvantaged groups; Feminization of agriculture due to young male out-migration. Globalization trend has weakened competitive capacity of Nepalese SMEs. Fragmented policies have led to improper targeting in agricultural value chain. Inadequate support to the local governments for the localization of policies. Food and agriculture sector are highly vulnerable and the actors associated are more exposed to shocks. Discriminatory social norms and practices.

Drivers of Change (positive): The Constitutional provisions on Right to Food and Food Sovereignty and Social Justice are key drivers for advancing equitable access to food and livelihood security. In addition, the Agriculture Development Strategy, Zero-hunger Initiative, Multi-Sector Nutrition Plan and localization of SDGs are positive drivers as the local governments can reach out to the poor and disadvantaged. Increased realization of potential niche-based enterprise and industrialization of local products through value addition and use of IT. Increased interest of financing institutions and development partners towards green policies and funds. Land management based on concurrent rights of the governments.

Actions in next 3 years for greater impact: Support mechanisms and targets to small and commercial farmers as well as investments in commodity-based enterprises. Introduction of farmers' identification card and develop proper database. Gender friendly mechanization and investments in land management, skills development, financing, and linkage with market. Engage youths in profitable agriculture that can enhance niche-based local products. Enforce/levy duties on the imports of agricultural products to facilitate secure market for local products. Strengthen local seed sector that are culturally acceptable, climate resilient and profitable. Consumers' demand-based planning for production and support in post-production related infrastructure. For the destitute group, issue food supply card as per the provision of the RtF and Food Sovereignty Act as well as ensure targeted interventions linking with social safety net programs.

Options to assess the actions being successful: Documentation of indigenous crops, commodities and recipes and wider sharing/publicity of their nutrition values; communication strategy in place to ensure proper messaging of local foods that are locally understandable and culturally sensitive; linkage of local foods with big hotels, domestic and export markets.

Collaboration/Partnership: Federal government to devise harmonized umbrella policy including safety net measures and proper monitoring for standardisation; Provincial and local government to focus on customizing policies to their specific needs and priorities to promote inclusive and diverse food systems and facilitate collaboration with Universities and academia to engage youth in the research and extension. The local governments to document, promote, support in identification of locally available nutrition rich local landraces, promote culturally adaptive food eating habits, manage local seed and food banks, promote indigenous knowledge and skills-based food system. Farmer identification/categorization/Id card.

### 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

### Discussion Topic AT5: Building resilience to vulnerabilities, shocks, and stresses

Context: current food system is under pressure from climate crisis, conflict, COVID-19 pandemics, economic shocks, natural disasters and environmental degradation, including food price hikes and disease-pests outbreaks. These shocks, stress and disaster can be devastating for poor and vulnerable people. Climate induced and other natural disasters have significant impact on national economy. Lately, COVID-19 has contributed to increase unemployment, poverty and vulnerability including loss of livelihoods. The 2015 Earthquake increased number of food insecure people by 3.5 million. Therefore, building resilience means helping individuals, households and communities to mitigate, cope with and recover from shocks and stresses, so that they can become even better off than before.

Underlying causes/barriers: natural and climate induced disasters; high post-production losses; weak supply chain; pandemics (COVID-19) and other epidemics. Economic shocks, like food price hikes and income losses due to pandemics and disasters. Climate induced natural disasters are increasing more than before due to haphazard road constructions, improper infrastructure development and accelerated process of urbanizations. Limited investment on R&D to reduce vulnerability and build resilience. Farmers and stakeholders lack adequate incentives for climate initiatives and green agriculture. High post-production losses, unsafe transportation and weak supply chain resulting in inadequate/late access of safe food in affordable prices for marginal, poor and low income groups. Epidemics/pandemic (such as diarrhea, COVID-19, etc) have increased vulnerability of poor, women, and marginalized households. Improper food habits with poor feeding practices. Poor, landless, and marginalized groups have settlements in vulnerable places (river banks, landslide prone areas). Preparation and readiness arrangements are weak.

Drivers of change: Lack of policy instruments, particularly of food policy at all spheres of governments on building resilience. Lack of in-depth analysis, data gap in production and consumption of foods have posed challenge to policy makers to design adequate policies and programmes to reduce vulnerability and build resilience. Inadequate climate smart technologies have affected to adapt to changing climate and improved food availability. Furthermore, price vulnerability and supply chain disruption have also contributed to the unsustainable food production and resilience building.

Actions in next 3 years for greater impact: land use policy at sub-national level; technology transfer; capacity development of stakeholders in agriculture; increase coverage of insurance; make agriculture an attractive sector; and control out-migration. Policy coherence; prioritization of resources in the critical time; food storage at local level. Institutionalization of Nepal food security monitoring system (NeKSAP); early warning system and risk-based anticipatory actions. Establish climate smart technology and incentivize for their promotion; integrate sustainable agricultural production system including indigenous best practices. Link Prime Minister/Chief Minister employment programme with the food systems. Co-ordination mechanisms between the governments for disaster and post-disaster management.

Options to assess the actions being successful: Result framework, indicators, and software-based information management system in place to monitor the progress; climate and vulnerability monitoring provisions; and development of information centers and network at sub-national level.

Collaboration/Partnership: Coordination among the governments and private sectors to build resilience; priority plans based on available resources; provision of vulnerability card to the vulnerable people and nutritious food to the Pregnant and Lactating Women; sub-national level emergency operation centers to be linked to food system; federal government to establish a reliable Hydro-met services; all governments and private sectors to coordinate developing better preparedness plan.

### 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 - 6/6

Discussion Topic AT6: Right to Food and Food Sovereignty Act-a legal framework for sustainable food systems in Nepal

Context: Nepal has developed legal framework to ensure good governance of food systems and transform them. The right to food and food sovereignty is enshrined in the constitution, and the government has given priority to ensure safe and nutritious food to all in a sustainable manner. This Act accommodates all ATs and provides as a legal framework for the resilient, equitable and sustainable food systems in Nepal.

Underlying causes for achieving the stated proposition: In general, policies are often prepared in rush, and with less attention to preparing detail action plan. Lack of organized efforts in the implementation of policies. Poor accountability measures on the implementation of laws/policies. Governments, particularly at local levels have low level of awareness and technical capacity to prepare laws and policies.

Key Drivers: Limited livelihood opportunity and consumption of nutritious food; lack of proper information collection, analysis and management to identify and respond to vulnerable people; access to land is important aspect in food security, however there is no sufficient action to address this issue. Policies are not much supportive to smallholders and landless people. Less legal thrust, or incentive to consume locally produced nutritious food. Lack of impact analysis to understand the results of policy implementation to address the challenges.

Actions in next 3 for greater impact: approval of Right to Food and Food Sovereignty Act (2018) and formulation of regulation based on this Act , and development guideline and setting up of institutional architecture as provisioned in the Act with clear roles and responsibilities and accountability measures (Federal Food Council, Provincial Food Council and Local Food Coordination Committee). Priority to orient stakeholders on the implementation of Act with targeted focus, budget, and preparation of regulations. Allocation of budget to the Province and local governments based on the performance on the implementation of Act and relevant policies. Implementation of 15th Plan, Periodic Plans, and localization of SDGs with priority. Control fragmentation of agricultural land; prioritize and invest on setting up a mechanism for systematic data collection, analysis, and management for promoting evidence-based policy making to contribute to achieve sustainable food system in Nepal. Ensure policy coherence in agriculture, food security and nutrition; build synergies among policies like MSNP, ADS, SDGs and others. Coordination among government agencies and stakeholders. Capacity development of local government. Identification and classification of farmers and landless households. Set up mechanism to analyze and respond to the impact of climate change.

Options to assess the actions being successful: policy monitoring mechanism in place for different government agencies and stakeholders with relevant indicators based on the Right to Food and Food Sovereignty Act, SDGs, HDI, Hunger Index, Gini Coefficient, and food security and nutrition; annual planning/budgeting linked to the evidence-based information as guided by the Act; information management system and networks are in place at all levels.

Collaboration/Partnership: Federal government to facilitate on detailing out of the implementation plan; Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock Development to take lead role, in collaboration with other key line ministries/policy agencies (NPC, MoIC, MoFAGA) to implement the Right to Food and Food Sovereignty Act (2018) and set up institutional architecture (Federal Food Council). NPC and MoALD to coordinate and facilitate on developing National Food Plan. Accordingly, Provinces and local governments to coordinate on developing Provincial and local food plan and setting up of the institutional architectures (Province Food Council and Food Coordination Committee); NPC to take lead on coordination and collaboration among sectoral agencies and strategic guidance on policy formulation, implementation and monitoring.

### 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**

There was no marked observation on the areas of divergence.

### **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