

# OFFICIAL FEEDBACK FORM

<b>DIALOGUE DATE</b>	Friday, 15 October 2021 14:00 GMT +02:00
<b>DIALOGUE TITLE</b>	Shortening the food supply chain: Benefits and drawbacks for urban and rural areas
<b>CONVENED BY</b>	Generation Climate Europe
<b>DIALOGUE EVENT PAGE</b>	<a href="https://summitdialogues.org/dialogue/28650/">https://summitdialogues.org/dialogue/28650/</a>
<b>DIALOGUE TYPE</b>	Independent
<b>GEOGRAPHICAL FOCUS</b>	European Union

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

8

## PARTICIPATION BY AGE RANGE

0-18

7

19-30

1

31-50

51-65

66-80

80+

## PARTICIPATION BY GENDER

1

Male

7

Female

Prefer not to say or Other

## NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS IN EACH SECTOR

1

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

3

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

3

Health care  
Nutrition  
National or local government  
Utilities  
Industrial  
Other

## NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS FROM EACH STAKEHOLDER GROUP

2

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

1

Workers and trade union  
Member of Parliament  
Local authority  
Government and national institution  
Regional economic community  
United Nations  
International financial institution  
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?

To account for the variety of stakeholders who constitute them, we reached out to individuals from 5 different fields 1° Community-level groups 2° Scholars 3° Policy-makers 4° Youth groups 5° Retailers/market actors By inviting actors from various European countries and with conflicting positions, we also attempted to reflect the complexity of the topic. Additionally, we insisted on the anonymity of our guests' inputs in this feedback, and we kept the discussion small to ensure everyone would dare to speak up. We also kept it "closed" (i.e. we did not stream it), to make the discussion a safe place for all to express their opinions (build trust).

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

By organising our dialogue around the theme of short food supply chains (SFSC), we aimed to enrich the discussion on the topic, as we believe it has potential to promote good stewardship of natural resources, bring respect for local contexts to the fore, strengthen the resilience of local communities and improve the well-being of its individuals (be respectful). As a youth organisation, we made a conscious effort to invite young people to the table, as they get fewer opportunities to make their voices heard on the topic. In this, we strived to complement the efforts of others working on SFSC, to fill the gap in the field which had not been approached from a youth perspective in other dialogues and with a focus on urban-rural relationships.

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

Start sending the invitations early if you want a variety of actors around the table, because certain categories of actors (in our case policy-makers, food retailers) have agendas that are more packed than others (scholars, youth groups, community groups). Sending out invitations late might harm representativity of a broad range of actors.

# 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

We were planning on staying close to the methodology of the Convenors Reference Manual, but given the number of participants, we did not divide the guests into breakout rooms as we had initially planned to do. There were 6 of us from GCE. The dialogue lasted 2 hours, with a discussion of about 1h40. We did not have a single curator. Instead, one of us opened the dialogue with a short (less than 10 minutes) introduction speech presenting our organisation (Generation Climate Europe) and the topic and subtopics that were going to be discussed, as well as contextualising the dialogue in the broader UNFSS framework and exposing the desired outcomes of the dialogue. This introduction was followed by a round of presentation of all those present, including the organisers of the dialogue. The discussion itself was steered by 2 moderators who were supported by 1 technician who was writing questions in the chat box, keeping the time, etc. They ensured everyone contributed to the conversation and attempted to build bridges/run a red thread between the contributions of the different actors around the table. They also asked our guests questions to feed in the conversation and ensure the different topics we wanted to cover were discussed: 1° The environmental and economic sustainability of SFSC 2° Upscaling local solutions of SFSC 3° Encouraging youth engagement in SFSC We managed to create an environment of trust in which everyone felt confident to express their experiences and points of view. There was no still moment in which no one had anything to say. On the contrary, we sometimes had to guide our guests to the next point of discussion before the previous one had dried up. One of the two moderators closed the dialogue with a ~10 min conclusion bringing together the insights of all our guests. Points of divergence did arise, stemming from - The different geographic backgrounds of our guests (e.g. a guest from Poland found herself in a drastically different environment than guests from Italy, France, England in her efforts to promote SFSC). - Our guests' different approaches to promote SFSC (e.g. a guest representing a vertical farm and relying on advanced technologies to enhance the productivity of the farm vs scholars more acquainted with organic/agro-ecological farming) Points of convergence also surfaced, notably on the efforts needed from governments and the need to cultivate a new understanding of food and to give it a more important place in our lives.

# 4. DIALOGUE FOCUS & OUTCOMES

## MAJOR FOCUS

The dialogue tackled the ways to and problems identified to shorten Food Systems supply chains in Europe. This can be related to every Action Tracks, but more specifically with the first, second and fifth ones (Shift to sustainable consumption patterns and Build resilience to vulnerabilities, shocks and stress).

Our three main focuses during the dialogue were:

1° The environmental and economic sustainability of SFSC. The following sub-topics were discussed in detail here:

- a) Challenges faced when trying to grow local food in ways that limit harm to the environment while trying to be economically sustainable at the same time.
- b) Food affordability challenges and potential ways to ensure food remains affordable to everyone, including low-income citizen groups and vulnerable groups of people.

2° Upscaling local solutions of SFSC. The following sub-topics were discussed in detail here:

- a) Barriers to scaling up to achieve systemic change, and ways to improve upscaling.
- b) Types of policies (i.e. EU/regional/city level etc.) needed to support upscaling.
- c) Local solutions as a way to build resilience to vulnerabilities and shocks.

3° Encouraging youth engagement in SFSC. The following sub-topics were discussed in detail here:

- a) The role of youth and how to include youth in food supply chains.
- b) Ways youth can support in realising the benefits of short supply chains.

### ACTION TRACKS

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

## MAIN FINDINGS

### 1) Environmental and economic sustainability

Need to involve all stakeholders, including civil society and consumers to achieve systemic changes.

There is sometimes a trade-off between supplying local and sustainable goods: for a given cooperative, there is a dilemma between their desire to sell local and sustainable products only (while being aware that their customers will buy non-local, unsustainable products in supermarkets anyways), or propose sustainable products that are not local (also because sometimes a specific good is not produced locally following sustainable practices).

Focus on consumers to change the supply chain.

- As they currently lack knowledge about hidden costs of the supply chains, their empowerment is needed by informing them, notably through clear labelling of the products' economic and environmental quality.
- Re-giving food the importance it should have in our lives, enhancing public consciousness of its value → could reduce food waste and increase time/efforts/share of income dedicated to it.
- A problem is that buying power remains the most important criterion (food security) for consumers. Financial tools could help internalise externalities in food production and guide citizens towards more sustainably produced food
- Idea of differentiated VAT depending on product (e.g. taxing fruits/vegetables at 0%, meat at highest level)
- Carbon pricing of food
- Withdrawal/reduction of subsidies for 'unsustainable agriculture' (e.g. beef)
- "Social security of food": e.g. give an allocation to families that wouldn't have enough resources to purchase sustainable food.
- But: issue of the weight of lobbies

Question of socio-economic fairness along the chain: a few retailers capture a lot of economic value at the expense of the many farmers

### 2) Upscaling local solutions

More participatory democracy can mobilize actors around the transition towards more sustainable food systems, to get them thinking about it and engage them.

- Foster the idea of a food policy, which already exists at local level, at European level. → Idea of a European food policy committee as a discussion platform involving all stakeholders: policy-makers, scientists, etc.
- At a more local level, rural parliaments could be established as platforms/a space where rural people could express their opinions, to enhance cooperation between rural and urban areas.
- Creations of hubs where farmers and consumers could meet.

Cities:

- Role of medium-size cities in connecting rural and urban areas
- Role of eurocities to be the intermediate between smaller cities and European institutions

Urban agriculture (e.g. viverein, Rome): Way to educate people about what it involves to grow food, the work it represents, and so the value of food more broadly. Moreover, it can also be a catalyser for change as it shows citizens how the system can be changed.

We identified problematics resulting from the EU policy framework:

- it can prevent sustainable public procurement (public school canteens) under competition law. There is no possibility to discriminate for local and sustainable food.
- Also, European subsidies favour unsustainable agriculture (eg. for beef farming and milk, creating a huge food surplus due to subsidies). These subsidies for unsustainable agriculture should be discontinued or at least decreased. There is a need instead for Institutional support of cooperatives that are growing local and sustainable food.

### 3) Youth engagement in short supply chains

We underlined the importance of sensibilisation of the work of farmers to young people: give new signals, that farmers have actually a social utility, to enhance interest in their work.

Supporting connections between young farmers and more experienced farmers so that they can learn from each other.

Creating new job opportunities to bring back people to rural areas is important.

Educative projects needed from a young age to popularise projects like CSA and food coops among youth.

Underlining the obstacles from conservative governments preventing young people to voice their interests. More generally, seeing youth not as protesters but as stakeholders would be a first step.

Following the example of some European institutions and the local authorities of different cities, youth could be given an institutionalised way to bring its opinion to politicians.

## 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 checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	Data & Evidence
<input type="checkbox"/>	Human rights	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Governance
<input checked="" 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

Does not apply to us as we did not have any breakout rooms, the whole discussion was conducted with the whole group.

### 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

Consumer responsibility: Although there was agreement on the need to change consumer behaviour, there was some extent of disagreement on the share of responsibility that should be borne by consumers. Some guests insisted that responsibility should not only be put on their shoulders but also on governments' → can have a role to play in constraining food choices/big companies and in informing them, notably through regulating food marketing (e.g. banning greenwashing). Others highlighted that too little responsabilisation hinders change.

Vertical farming: An asset or not?

1) Benefits: According to one of our guests personally involved in a vertical farming initiative

- Can tackle restricted access to land
- Enables land use savings and water savings
- Control of the environment that happens in indoor farms seems especially promising In the face of climate change
- According to a study from Wageningen University and Delft University technology (both in the Netherlands), production in vertical farms could reduce CO2 use by 67% (UAE) to 92% (NLD) compared with greenhouses. This figure is even higher for open field farming
- Will become less expensive with economies of scale → finance should be unlocked to incentivise investments (costs of entry are high)

2) Critiques (put forward by other guests)

- Which criteria was this study based on?
- Remains expensive and energy-intensive. Economies of scale could occur in the next 5-10 years, making it affordable and less energy-intensive.
- What about poorer countries that cannot invest in the technologies, etc.

Relevance of discussing this at European level given geographic discrepancies questioned: Engagement of consumers varies, support of government too.

Ambiguity between the need to raise the value of food to e.g. decrease food waste, and social equity.

### 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 |