

OFFICIAL FEEDBACK FORM

DIALOGUE DATE	Thursday, 8 July 2021 09:00 GMT -04:00
DIALOGUE TITLE	Territorial governance for sustainable food systems
CONVENED BY	UNESCO Chair on Food, Biodiversity and Sustainability Studies, Wilfrid Laurier University
DIALOGUE EVENT PAGE	https://summitdialogues.org/dialogue/30090/
DIALOGUE TYPE	Independent
GEOGRAPHICAL FOCUS	No borders

The outcomes from a Food Systems Summit Dialogue will be of use in developing the pathway to sustainable food systems within the locality in which they take place. They will be a valuable contribution to the national pathways and also of interest to the different workstreams preparing for the Summit: the Action Tracks, Scientific Groups and Champions as well as for other Dialogues.

1. PARTICIPATION

TOTAL NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS

85

PARTICIPATION BY AGE RANGE

0 0-18 19 19-30 28 31-50 21 51-65 7 66-80 0 80+

PARTICIPATION BY GENDER

33 Male 48 Female 4 Prefer not to say or Other

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS IN EACH SECTOR

10	Agriculture/crops	10	Education	0	Health care
1	Fish and aquaculture	2	Communication	3	Nutrition
1	Livestock	0	Food processing	10	National or local government
0	Agro-forestry	0	Food retail, markets	0	Utilities
10	Environment and ecology	1	Food industry	0	Industrial
1	Trade and commerce	3	Financial Services	34	Other

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS FROM EACH STAKEHOLDER GROUP

3	Small/medium enterprise/artisan	0	Workers and trade union
0	Large national business	1	Member of Parliament
0	Multi-national corporation	4	Local authority
6	Small-scale farmer	9	Government and national institution
0	Medium-scale farmer	1	Regional economic community
0	Large-scale farmer	21	United Nations
7	Local Non-Governmental Organization	4	International financial institution
16	International Non-Governmental Organization	2	Private Foundation / Partnership / Alliance
3	Indigenous People	3	Consumer group
20	Science and academia	10	Other

2. PRINCIPLES OF ENGAGEMENT

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

The Territorial Governance for Sustainable Food Systems Independent Dialogue engaged with stakeholders across sectors to build on ongoing efforts to address complex and urgent issues within our food systems through innovative territorial governance. The goal of the dialogue was to bring existing and new collaborators together to engage in inclusive discussions to concretely identify how a territorial approach addresses governance issues across pathways for food system transformation. In order to incorporate and advance the Principles of Engagement—particularly acting with urgency, committing to the summit, recognizing complexity, embracing multi-stakeholder inclusivity, complementing the work of others, and building trust—the Dialogue Convenor and other event organizers consulted with the international Ad Hoc Working Group on Territorial Food System Governance to design an appropriate format for the Dialogue, identify key areas of interest for the breakout groups, and find expert moderators to ensure that discussions were inclusive, respectful, and productive. This approach ensured that the Dialogue was of interest to a diverse range of participants, created the opportunity to showcase as many voices as possible, and effectively captured the multiplicity of voices in the Dialogue feedback. In order to foster new connections and enable the emergence of new ways forward, the Dialogue format included three parts: 1) short plenary presentations offering high-level insights on territorial governance for sustainable food systems; 2) thematic breakout groups where participants engaged in extended dialogue about key themes; and 3) a report back session where breakout groups shared insights, looked for synergies, and engaged in further discussion. Throughout the program, participants were invited to share their perspectives, ask questions, and build new connections. Following the Dialogue, plenary recordings, transcripts, and the Dialogue Report were shared with all registrants to ensure that others can build on this work.

HOW DID YOUR DIALOGUE REFLECT SPECIFIC ASPECTS OF THE PRINCIPLES?

In addition to incorporating a participatory format that created the opportunity for multi-stakeholder inclusivity and meaningful dialogue, this Dialogue was designed to reflect all of the Food System Summit Principles of Engagement. Plenary speakers were selected based on their ability to speak to the complex nature of territorial governance for sustainable food systems from a diverse range of perspectives, including from within government, civil society, and the research community. All plenary speakers recognized the urgency of sustained and meaningful action at all levels to reach the 2030 SDGs and spoke directly to the need to complement and build on the work of others already advocating for new, more sustainable territorial approaches to food system governance. Rosado-May, Professor, Universidad Intercultural Maya de Quintana Roo, México, provided an indigenous perspective and spoke to the ways territorial governance for sustainable food systems complements indigenous ways of knowing and caring for the land. Each breakout group was moderated by experts in the field with the facilitation skills required to build trust and respectfully manage discussions. The breakout groups were allotted the most time in the Dialogue program to create the time and space for multi-stakeholder inclusivity and put as many voices as possible in conversation with one another. What emerged was a rich diversity of insights and forward-looking policy suggestions that centre territorial governance as a key lever for sustainable food system change. Skilled notetakers carefully documented the discussions to ensure the Dialogue report reflects their complexity and includes collectively identified pathways for food system transformation through territorial governance contributing to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. At the end of the Dialogue, all participants were invited to join the Ad Hoc Working Group on Territorial Food System Governance to continue to engage in meaningful discussions and action on territorial approaches to governance for food system transformation.

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

Appreciating the Principles of Engagement was key to the success of this Dialogue. In particular, a focus on multi-stakeholder inclusivity, complimenting the work of others, and building trust informed all aspects of the Dialogue planning, beginning with consultation with the Ad Hoc Working Group on Territorial Food System Governance. This consultation ensured that the Dialogue program reflected the urgency and complexity of territorial governance for sustainable food systems while prioritizing participant engagement. This consultation also enabled effective promotion of the Dialogue through the extended networks of the Ad Hoc Working Group and the event organizers, the UNESCO Chair on Food, Biodiversity and Sustainability Studies and CIRAD.

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

Territorial governance (TG) can enable functional, sustainable food system transformation and is rights-based, ensures access to nourishing food for all, and protects biodiversity, equity and livelihoods. This Independent Food Systems Summit Dialogue on Territorial Governance for Sustainable Food Systems rests on years of coalition building including the Territorial Perspectives for Development initiative and reflects understandings of actors from EC, BMZ, AFD, CIRAD, GIZ, OECD, FAO, UNCDF and NEPAD. It adds to the Independent Global Dialogue Empowering Cities and Local Governments to improve food systems globally; HLPF side event Territorial Approaches for Inclusive and Resilient Food Systems and UN Food Systems pre-Summit Territorial governance for sustainable food systems.

Plenary speakers with notes:

M. Lapão, Director Cooperation, Community of Portuguese Speaking Countries spoke to multiscale governance founded on food/nutrition security and the right to adequate food. A territorial approach promotes social participation, so policymakers make better decisions and systemic inter/multi sector food policies, programs and investments. Seven national food security and nutrition policy councils exist with reps from civil society, academia, private sector and parliaments that foster more coherent food governance through several regional cooperation programs and national policies.

Gabriel Ferrero de Loma-Ororio, Ambassador at Large for Global Food Security, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, EU and Cooperation, Spain spoke about territories as unique and integrative connectors. In Spain's experience, TG works when national enabling environments are coupled with participatory and inclusive TG platforms to merge local actors with national level agencies and programs. Alliances with adequate financial support and instruments to foster national level change could trigger territorial approaches broadly and scale up to the global level. The Food System Summit can merge and catalyze this collective movement for food system transformation and as a core element to realize the 2030 agenda.

R. Messias, Policy and Advocacy Officer, UCLG. As food systems are fundamental to reshaping our relationship with the planet, we need to work for people's well-being and preserve the global commons. This requires concerted multilevel connections, action and collaboration among cities and territories that give voice to citizens through bottom-up/top-down approaches. National frameworks are required as guidelines and institutional and financial frameworks are needed for cohesive territorial action, e.g. UCLG/UN Habitat work to develop voluntary local and national reviews. Food systems are key to enable ecological transformation from farm to waste, e.g. urban/rural GHG emissions and impacts on the global commons. Intermediary cities are key to TG because of their size, strategic position in the territory, and direct connections to hinterlands.

S. Marta, Coordinator, A Territorial Approach to the SDGs, OECD

As more than 100 of the 169 SDG targets can't be achieved without local and regional governments engagement, SDGs can enable national, local and regional governments to: 1) implement a multisector territorial approach; 2) use SDGs as a policymaking tool; and 3) Manage trade-offs and promote synergies among sector policies. Requires shifts: to territories and multisector approach; from one-size fits all to place-based approaches; and to engage multilevel governance to create functional territories beyond local boundaries.

E. Valette, Professor, CIRAD. University researchers can: 1) produce new methods and scientific knowledge (e.g. assessment and diagnostic tools) to better understand TG contexts and support collective decision-making; 2) support collaboration between multiple knowledge systems for a richer, more effective knowledge base to inform context-specific decisions and help stakeholders govern along continuously enriched pathways; and 3) foster dialogue and provide a framework for discussion. Together these can increase actors' control over transformation and support new partnership design and interventions adapted to each situation.

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

Small scale farmers can no longer eat what they produce and cannot access or afford the food they need. Local food markets have been progressively eroded by an increasingly globalized food system that disconnects producers and consumers. The distortions of present food systems reflect the commodity approach and trade focus on export-driven agriculture policies that prioritize imports into growing cities. We have ignored local culture and indigenous knowledge, opting instead for push uniform approaches. This aggravates the power asymmetry between increasingly concentrated big corporations and fragmented small-scale producers, culture and nature, that results in a major urban-rural disconnect. Policies are ineffective and patch-work. Farmers have been led to monoculture through decades of government incentives and inappropriate financial support. Transformative innovation which builds on local and indigenous knowledge for sustainable local ecosystems needs to replace conservative innovation geared to support the present economic model. To realize the transition to sustainable food systems through territorial governance, support is needed to integrate across multiple scales and sectors. This requires:

- o Advocacy: Level of engagement with policymakers and integration of policy makers into dialogues; accountability mechanisms established, etc.
- o Policy reform: Policies changed/influenced, engagement in processes
- o Connecting production with consumption: Food and farm movements that act at the neighborhood/village scale can address different policy spaces and speak to local city governments to reach up to national level governments
- o Focus on coalitions: Coalitions across urban and rural communities at the ground level are what move policy spaces at the local level, in turn influence larger cities and gain traction at the national level
- o Address conflict between agriculture and trade values and priorities: Farmers must have viable livelihoods and consumers must be able to access a healthy/affordable food supply from local and distant sources. A recent OECD report states while US\$720 billion/year was provided from 2018–20 for agricultural subsidies, only one in six dollars promoted sustainable productivity growth and agricultural resilience. Shifting subsidies to support agroecology and small-scale community-driven food businesses would be transformative. <https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/sites/2d810e01-en/index.html?itemId=/content/publication/2d810e01-en>
- o Co-create and re-design agricultural extension services: Extension services must integrate local and indigenous knowledge. Institutionalizing these services with cross-ministerial collaboration can ensure incentive and expenditure efficiencies. Seed-saving in Cuba could be a model for territorial governance practices. Begun in the early 2000s, it now serves 75 municipalities in 12 provinces with an emphasis on opportunities for women and youth (<https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fsufs.2020.554414/full>).
- o Establish multi-stakeholder partnerships: The critical point of institutionalization is to make councils/groups/partnerships, such as National Food Councils, official with links to financing and institutional support as a structure for planning and budgeting in a multisectoral multilevel and multi-actor way
- o Foster inclusion: To address to achieve transformative territorial governance, power imbalances must be addressed and accountability made transparent. For example, in Africa, the Community of Portuguese Speaking Countries linked sustainable territorial food systems and healthy diets in two projects through a bottom-up process that engaged actors at the regional and national scales. The participatory, multi-scaled diagnostic approach identified local, national and regional policy recommendation. Challenges include the need for more reliable financial support as well as on-going political commitment.
- To do this work, communities need:
 - o Participatory monitoring efforts which engage/validate/build trust and measure contextually established indicators for success
 - o Access to services to enable engagement to establish shared vision(s), action plans, participation from women/youth, conflict resolutions, technology integration, etc. It is crucial for farmers to engage in local markets, connect with cities and consumers requiring the right set of services and produce quality food, reduce losses, and engage with other actors.
 - o Community participation in decision-making bodies, policy-setting and program development, along with citizen-led monitoring approaches that can drive better standards and accountability
 - o Financial resource mobilization, including disbursements to communities to support needs, guarantees provided for financial flows, and increased engagement of financial actors. Design public and private finance so it can be contextualized at a local level to support farmer and community transition to agroecology, processing and infrastructure with a wide variety of instruments and mechanisms: nature-positive subsidies, carbon credits/payments for ecosystem services, agricultural/forestry insurance products, grants for development processes, technical assistance, longer-term tenure loans, etc.
 - o Concise land policy and an integrated and inclusive land planning approach, that reflects the many, varied interests in a territory (rural/urban areas, indigenous groups, commercial farmers).

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

Coherent, functional territorial governance can foster equitable management of food systems, integrate rural and urban food governance, promote inclusive investment for territorial governance, direct support to local food actors, increase data availability and accessibility, private sector business support, and advise on issues of food security and territorial governance at ministerial levels.

- Scaled policies and good practices can crystalize solutions to ensure needed impacts at territorial levels and bring everyone in the system together. These can be designed into context-specific projects and programs but also provide cross-cutting solutions relevant in several contexts. While locals build good practices, continued effort is needed for flexible, replicable models and knowledge-sharing networks (e.g., “FAO Inclusive and Sustainable Territories and Landscapes Platform” <http://www.fao.org/in-action/territorios-inteligentes/socios/fr/>). The key is to gather varied and diverse experiences related to territorial development as a model adaptation/building tool, as well as connection/collaboration effort + creation of communities of practices, e.g. Farm Field and Business Schools enable farmers on the ground and offer a programmatic solution that can be scaled. Mobilization builds cross-sectoral and cross-service dialogue and coordination to reduce fragmentation between public, private, NGO, and producer organizations so small-scale producers do not fall through the cracks, where collective action is led by farmers to improve service provision from all angles and provide programmatic examples that can be scaled to a broader framework/approach.

- To build functional territories, urban-rural linkages are key. UN Habitat helps to map complex linkages—particularly documented cases that illustrate effective vertical and horizontal multilevel linkages to provide guidance to actors at all levels. For thematic and learning guides, tools and compendia of inspiring practices, see: <https://urbanpolicyplatform.org/>.

- The Territorial Perspective for Development (TP4D) observed that challenges are often clustered in the same way the Summit identifies solution clusters. For example, food system challenges are associated with economic, adversity, migration and other priorities already high on the list for local and sub-national authorities—identifying the intersections can place food security similarly high on the priority list of multi-scaled actors. As we learned with COVID-19, municipalities have to coordinate across many agencies and sectors that don't interact—it is difficult to engage local decision makers whose operational demands are often crisis driven.

- To better monitor this work we need: measurement (of what, in which way, is it effective, is it enough?), citizen-led accountability for reporting and monitoring and government involvement in developing models. Accountability is a priority where the goal is to remove overt pressure and antagonistic elements. It is possible to identify problems and barriers in collaborative ways to improve service delivery and standards, e.g. community score cards is a solution through citizen-led accountability.

- The need to bring family farmers and territorial governance together requires UN agencies, with their different sectoral mandates, to collaborate and ask how to expand public services in a rights-based context to advance food systems. Guiding practices developed by lead agencies for their own purposes with their own institutional mandates are now converging—these frameworks need to be adapted as a foundation for co-governance by urban and rural actors supported by the appropriate levels of government. Sectors and communities of practice need to consider developing and implementing joint and cohesive policy that will support these phases of discovery by: 1) policy adjustment; 2) setting priorities, 3) engagement and support from public and private financing; and, 4) collaboration between academics and governments. We need a call for the representation of sub-national and local authorities that have a space in food security discussions at larger scales.

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

We need a new paradigm and vision for local food strategies and policies which are integrated in a functional multi-level territorial governance system. Food regulation is a political issue and should not be delegated to the market—food must be recognized as a right not a commodity.

Local governments are best placed to integrate economic, environmental and social dimensions, bring together public actors, private sector and civil society and mediate trade-offs. They can help integrate sectors (e.g. restaurants and producers, promote local food hubs, facilitate access to digital technologies for aggregation) and ensure balance between food trade and local food systems.

It is important to identify and support local actors, recognize the wisdom of the people that are there (first and foremost Indigenous Peoples) and prioritize transformative innovation (e.g., agroecology), building on local knowledge with science to create jobs and build resilient food systems. Local private sector actors are key players in working together to build a better system. Academic institutions should join local actors in documenting and reviewing relevant experience, providing technical assistance and linking with national or global research institutions.

Participatory and inclusive democracy is essential for good territorial governance to address power imbalances, leave no one behind (women, youth, Indigenous Peoples, migrants, displaced people) and avoid capture by local elites. Short-, medium- and long-term joint planning is needed to proactively address issues such as human rights, climate change or disaster-risk management (e.g. management of flood zones). Multi-stakeholder coalitions will be needed to design, implement and monitor systems approaches on relevant topics.

The following dimensions can be included in the agenda of territorial governance:

- Support strong local food/farmers' markets and connect producers and consumers (to harness their economic and political power). Consumer information, education and communication is essential. Scale up, not through corporatization or industrialization, but grow through aggregation with the support of appropriate local platforms controlled by local actors (e.g., food hubs) and local alliances.
- Land use planning with attention to urban-rural linkages to address urbanization, promote nature-based urbanization and reframe urban-rural linkages with nature-based interfaces.
- Diversification of food production, but also ensure sustainable management of natural resources (e.g., wild food harvesting). Revisit extension services, based on co-problem solving, and connect local actors (networks, local platforms, including community-driven platforms).
- Regeneration of degraded eco-systems and provision of environmental services
- Rebuild local knowledge systems to have a systems approach. We need knowledge-based systems rather than science-based solutions with academia as an active partner to co-create and share knowledge within sectors and across similar territories.

Municipalities and local governments have a series of tools to support the re-territorialization of food systems, such as public procurement (e.g. for school meals), zoning (eg. for public markets and community gardens/kitchens) or strategies to restore nature and culture. But the challenge is to integrate top-down and bottom-up approaches. The public sector can regain a role through the participatory construction and implementation of local food policies shifting from sectoral approaches to integrate all dimensions of territorial systems.

It is urgent to stop short term economic thinking and explore alternative financial incentives (slow money, municipal bonds geared to green infrastructure investments, ecosystem services payments etc.), seek inclusion and territoriality. Policies should support bonding and bridging through social networks. Food is not a commodity, it is about commons, rights and eco-system services—territorial governance can connect food systems with the land and the people that live in it. Territorialization is about empowering local actors to decide the future they want in the context they are in.

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 - 3/6

Territorial approaches can enable Integrated Natural Resource Management (INRM) with food systems as a unifying context for action:

1. Strengthen rule of law: Mainstream law-based approaches, participation, accountability, and transparency is needed at all food systems scales so communities have the right and are empowered to engage in INRM.
2. Integrate multi/cross-sector action: Silos challenge action including cross-sector communications. Limited knowledge and capacity raise questions about agricultural impact on water sources, biodiversity, conflicts behind land use or land tenure, and feedback with/to rural communities. Support is needed to facilitate/train for/develop capacity. Need to move landscapes/territorial planning from technocratic to rights-based (<http://www.fao.org/3/i2801e/i2801e.pdf>)
3. Learning exchanges to deepen mutual understanding of Agriculture, Food and Environment stakeholders: Need more systematic efforts to deepen mutual understanding among landscape stakeholders including challenge of values, e.g., knowing where, who, and how food is produced so consumers can make informed choices. Connect people to food system processes through dialogue, collaborative mapping for shared understanding and shift narratives. Consumer choice can push private sector (e.g. require supermarket chains to be transparent about food sources and add labels for CO2 emissions).
4. Mobilizing funding for landscape organization and investment: Funds for informal platforms or loose multi-stakeholder planning can be linked to more formal planning/decision-making structures. Landscapes and long-term resilience need links between local private sector and local SMEs that work beyond industrialized food system. Outside funding (e.g., GEF) can be useful but building bridges with other resources should be a priority.
5. Strengthening participation of marginalized stakeholders in governance: Pressing need to document territorial ethnic community food systems and ensure support to these foundational systems through financing, technical and policy resources.
6. Territorial alliances to advocate action for structural challenges: Structural issues around effective landscape/ecosystem action including poverty and food insecurity are significant challenges for cities/regional governments and impose pressing demands on budgets. Recovery packages could strengthen local food provision and build from innovative modalities (e.g., participatory budgeting). Structural issues need long term solutions, including shifting the narrative around food systems so needs are at the center. Subsidies can also be shifted. OECD agricultural subsidies totaled US\$720 billion/year from 2018-20, yet only one in six dollars promoted sustainable productivity growth and agricultural resilience. Shifting more money to agroecology would be game changing. <https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/sites/2d810e01-en/index.html?itemId=/content/publication/2d810e01-en>
7. Institutionalizing capacity development for landscape/ecosystem management and governance is varied and insufficient: From producer to consumer, knowledge/awareness of landscape processes is a critical gap. Local/regional governments can create/incentivize markets for ecological products and give voice to producers using traditional or indigenous practices. Tools can address growing pressure for land use transformation (e.g., integrated platforms; knowledge sharing networks; "grading" landscapes on performance; and labelling). See, for example, the 1000 Landscapes for 1 Billion People initiative www.landscapes.global; <https://www.climavore.org/>
8. Working more effectively with the private sector: As most funding is in the private sector including them in multistakeholder platforms could be critical. The main challenges are to: ensure decent livelihoods and investments in food systems at all levels; include small-scale producers and SMEs; address power inequities with bigger companies/investors; distribute funding so smallholders/SMEs have access to finance (e.g., public-private mixed company that supports local community food production while conserving the environment in Ecuador <https://www.agroazuay.ec/>).

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

Territorial governance can have greater impact in the short term through Integrated Natural Resource Management (INRM) to enable:

- The availability and institutionalization of support services needed by territorial communities and landscape partnerships. Tools and scale-appropriate technology are needed to support community engagement and information flow for agroecology, resource management, advocacy efforts for multi-level policy reform and access to markets.
 - Strengthening local governments along with strong transparency and accountability mechanisms for decision-making on public expenditure and strategy design for communities to have adequate oversight and influence to support their needs.
 - Bridging the gap between communities in territories and policymakers at different levels through organization, coordination, and advocacy efforts that include women and youth by providing tools, facilitation, and support services.
 - Land-tenure rights and land concession policy reform can provide common good benefits for natural resources and help ensure common good is established as the goal not a simplistic productivity focus by private landholders and private sector. For the longer term, need to develop cross-generational territorial visions that integrate community needs developed through a bottom-up process including women and youth to manage pressures on natural resources while balancing livelihood needs. This requires resources to support the planning, design and implementation of landscape-wide visions and action. Private sector intervention and participation within INRM needs to respect each community and be managed through facilitation services so community stakeholders direct natural resource management. Support for conflict resolution and management across a territory and/or landscape can foster this process.
- There are more project-based approaches versus a process-based approach for longer-term action plans that span over the time needed to support natural capital (e.g. 20+years). Projects can be integrated so they take place over a longer-term timeframe agreed upon by communities, preferably initiated at the design and implementation stages. This requires:
- Continued support for community cohesion, engagement and policy advocacy to enable INRM through forest networks at micro and macro levels across agriculture, fish-farming, production, and resource management. In particular support for the implementation of landscape-scale action plans to support land tenure through community advocacy and reform at different levels of policy.
 - Support for local government strengthening, through technical assistance, development of policy frameworks, policy advocacy for the mainstreaming of INRM approaches so bottom-up input stimulates national level changes.
 - Support for agroecological transitions through small-family agriculture projects and linking these to broader landscape-scale initiatives and international support organizations.
 - Co-create and re-design agricultural extension services which integrate local and indigenous knowledge to ensure contextual understanding and needs. Institutionalizing these services with cross-ministerial collaboration to ensure incentive and expenditure efficiencies.
 - Design public and private finance contextualized at a local level to support farmer and community transition to agroecology, processing and infrastructure with a wide variety of instruments and mechanisms: nature-positive subsidies, carbon credits/payments for ecosystem services, agricultural/forestry insurance products, grants for development processes, technical assistance, equipment, longer-term tenure loans, etc.
 - Support for inclusion of women and youth within territories, particularly through targeted interventions for capacity building in business development, self-awareness, self-confidence, and agricultural work.
 - Participatory monitoring efforts with communities serve the double function of engagement, validation, and trust building; as well as measuring contextually established indicators for success (i.e. watershed restoration, ha of riparian area restored, ha under agroecology, food production, etc.).

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 - 5/6

Actions that address the role of finance and related tools in territorial governance and food system sustainability need to:

- Link actions to the SDGs through coordination across scales with public procurement as a tool to bring goals together. A food lens is needed for all the work being done with the SDGs. We are missing the interconnections between different challenges—for example, biodiversity, climate change, food and nutrition security and access to water. Territorial perspectives that work through a community-based approach can address many of these challenges at the same time while stressing the right to food.
- Bring local food into care facilities. Move away from reliance on major oligopoly of food service providers. Why is food an auxiliary service rather than core service? Look to other places –e.g., Europe – for examples and models about how to make healthy food central to care.
- Connect food procurement to climate change and the opportunity to move toward territorial approaches for sustainable food procurement. Address the contradiction between cutting budgets and fulfilling commitments to SDGs. Sustainable procurement can result in healthier people and ecosystems and so can be a cost saving in the long run.
- Require longer transition periods for suppliers to adjust and working together to set expectations. Keeping out some of the goods that can be procured locally to look for closer sources. Establishing relationships with local suppliers—need tenders to have more competition.
- Link procurement to education to show how food is grown/harvested/ transported to help inspire future farmers and support learning about food systems. For example, in cooking class curriculum, add growing own plants to see full cycle.
- Create networks of actors, for example procurement officers, to help understand the landscape of people involved and possible actions. School food programs could help build public procurement dialogues and infrastructure.
- Breakdown government silos. Post-COVID periods will be important so school food programs ensure every child is getting a decent, nutritious meal. Lowest price tenders as a priority versus other social attributes including sustainable diets. There are gaps where people can work and push back against misconceptions, such as the notion that trade agreements are a solid barrier. Rather, we can make a lot of change within the current system and also chip away at the other parts.
- Procurement networks, infrastructure, and knowledge-sharing to foster knowledge co-creation and knowledge mobilization.
- Bring Indigenous communities and those using traditional practices to the table as decision makers to include knowledge that has supported sustainable food systems for millennia. Document and support different knowledges and different diets that are adapted to territorial circumstances.
- Write school food programs into law. Brazil provides an example of success in food school program.
- To monitor change, there is a need to steer away from outcomes that can create problems and false, over-simplified understandings about the dynamics and complexity that is the food system. Instead, there is a need to focus on process and deliverables. Dynamic monitoring systems that use targets and metrics, for example, process indicators, can be really helpful at shifting the narratives. The divergence between narratives and actions within countries—some may be funding programs through development initiatives but don't have programs in their own countries. New Zealand provides an example of how to start from a needs-based approach and scale to a universal program.
- More people need training and there needs to be succession planning for leaders within procurement to pass on process for success and share tacit knowledge.
- Organizations can contribute by joining networks and linking up across networks. This can include support for Food Policy Councils, educating people in legal terminology, and/or food policy for local procurement.

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

Governance refers to processes of negotiating needs, interests and perspectives of various stake-holders. To promote more inclusive food systems transformation, a central goal of territorial governance should be to increase the voice of marginalized groups and increase the accountability of the state. A pre-condition to this type of governance is a multi-sectorial government that is rights-based in its approach; this must be embedded into law for adequate follow through and not just theoretical value-signaling without action. Only through multi-actor governance can vulnerable people be heard.

In line with a Leave No One Behind (LNOB) framework, stakeholders should aim to create inclusive food systems that center socially and economically disadvantaged people and involve them in policy creation. The role of the state, then, is to fulfill and support strategies that center a right-to-food framework. Territorial governance approaches must have a systemic scaffolding that encourages social participation for all agents, for participation is crucial to how knowledge is produced. Lack of participation and lack of access to participation can lead to unjust and skewed governance that is not representative of the local needs.

Frames and strategies for institutional, policy and democratic innovation towards new multilevel model of food governance must be implemented. In the inclusion of indigenous voices and processes as well as other marginalized groups, there is a co-creation of knowledge that helps design more resilient and equitable methodologies of both food systems and land management; we reorient towards interculturality, a result of multiple ways of knowledge co-existing, in order to re-territorialize food systems and rebuild local knowledge.

Territorial governance policies must also consider economic inclusion; that is, develop programming that enhances the generative and economic capacity of poor communities. To promote LNOB-oriented policies, we must position human rights as central and pursue empowerment and involvement for all. It is essential to pursue programming that invests in rural, health and educational infrastructures and is invested in protecting indigenous food systems.

Currently, there is an obstacle of lack of participation from marginalized groups due to exclusion according to age, race, gender, and ethnic belonging. Territorial governance can help reduce tradeoffs of national policies that lack inclusion. Territorial governance, then, becomes a space for interaction between different cultures, which is essential to move towards reducing pervasive discrimination.

The LNOB framework understands conflict is the main driver of hunger hence it aims to create comprehensive and inclusive food systems that are conflict-resilient and enhance future prospects of peace.

Territorial governance approaches that collaborate with labor governance may be particularly adept to reduce conflict (i.e., gender-based labor discrimination) and contribute to social cohesion.

Organizational contributions include LNOB framework contributes to locating and developing governance structures that mobilize people to achieve equitable social inclusion. These systems recognize food and participation as a fundamental right. It is essential to also recognize ecological processes are not bound to any one territory; thus, territorial governance policies must also consider the role of culture and biocultural dynamics. This may involve the participation and cooperation of stakeholders across various territories.

LNOB approaches take into account the structures and systems already in place and pursue flexible approaches that take into account multiple dimensions simultaneously. We must aim to build stronger multi-level collaborations that communicate vertically as well as horizontally. Communication and decision-making should engage with stakeholders across levels and be informed through bottom up processes, not only top down.

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

Adapted from Rosado-May's remarks: Global warming, loss of biodiversity, soil erosion, hunger, pollution, among other crises challenge all cultures and peoples. Science has confirmed in recent years that Indigenous Peoples' Food Systems have been resilient and sustainable for centuries. They have been designed, managed and functioning within a cultural context that involves a complex of social, technological, ecological, economic (trade & marketing), governance, land tenure, horizontal decision making, and reflecting ways of processing information as well as constructing and passing on knowledge to new generations. This biocultural complexity explains the role of indigenous Peoples' Food Systems to preserve and enhance biodiversity, mitigate climate change, control soil erosion, and sustain global ecological processes that benefit the planet.

About 500 million Indigenous Peoples' around the world have, in their hands, minds and hearts, conserved around 80% of the natural resources, including seeds of crops adapted to almost any ecological setting on our planet. Scientific literature reports that farmers cultivating up to two ha produce 70-80% of the world's food; this figure has been challenged reducing the value to around 32%. The data does not specify how many of the smallholders' farmers are indigenous but we can assume that the vast majority of them are, and still apply their traditional knowledge. Lets' consider that 100% of the 500 million Indigenous Peoples' are responsible for the 32% world food production; as compared to the 7.9 billion people in the world, small farmers/Indigenous Peoples' represent only 6% of the world population. Impressive considering the many challenges those farmers are facing today.

Nevertheless, the resilience and the knowledge that supports Indigenous Peoples' Food Systems are being lost rapidly. Immediate policy interventions are needed to prevent their total loss.

How can we explain the above figures if it is not because of the resistance and resilience capacity of Indigenous Peoples forged over centuries? Indigenous Peoples understand that we live in a multicultural world, we also understand the value of different worldviews. As we all live in one house, we should learn how to maintain our multicultural settings and also build bridges for intercultural processes.

Plenary remarks: Enacting systemic change requires institutionalizing support and making it part of the formal/subnational structure. There are a plethora of informal platforms that exchange knowledge/share information and alliances, but there is a missing link to the formal planning/decision making structures. Linking platforms to formal planning/budgeting processes is key. There remain risks in this in terms of capture of power, preexisting power imbalances, inequality and discrimination so empowerment and capacity building will be critical.

Currently, there is a lack of participation in food systems from marginalized groups due to exclusion according to age, race, gender, and ethnic belonging. Territorial governance can help reduce tradeoffs of national policies that lack inclusion and can become a space for interaction between different cultures, an essential step to move to reducing pervasive discrimination. Many organizations are implementing solutions that refer to territory and to land governance. In Ethiopia, the national project on sustainable land management supports the legalization of watershed user cessations so locals can plan and manage their own watersheds at a scale of a couple of hundred hectares. Angola has gone through the process of an institutionalized farmer-field school approach integrating national rural extension services and linking local communities with local government and municipalities. The missing link is how to use these many context-specific solutions and make them part of the macro solution for food systems and territorial governance of food systems. To bridge this gap, we can bring together and integrate projects through longer-term action plans agreed on by communities that span the time needed to support natural capital (e.g., 20+years) and respect human rights. This requires:

- Continued support for community cohesion, engagement and policy advocacy to enable networks at micro and macro levels.
- Support for local government strengthening, through technical assistance, development of policy frameworks, policy advocacy to mainstream integrated approaches so bottom-up input stimulates national level changes.
- Support for agroecological transitions and integrated landscape management by linking community and small-scale initiatives to broader landscape-scale projects and international support organizations.
- Co-creation and re-design of agricultural extension services which integrate local and indigenous knowledge to ensure contextual understanding, and institutionalizing these services with cross-ministerial collaboration to ensure incentive and expenditure efficiencies.
- Design public and private finance for the local context to support farmer and community transition to agroecology, processing and infrastructure with a wide variety of instruments and mechanisms.
- Support for inclusion of women, youth, elders and traditional knowledge keepers within territories.
- Participatory monitoring efforts with communities to serve the double function of engagement, validation, and trust building; as well as measuring contextually established indicators for success (i.e., watershed restoration, hectares under: riparian area management, agroecology).

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

ATTACHMENTS AND RELEVANT LINKS

ATTACHMENTS

- **Territorial Governance for Sustainable Food Systems - complete plenary notes**
<https://summitdialogues.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/2021-07-08-Territorial-Governance-UNFSS-Independent-Dialogue-Transcript-and-Concluding-Remarks-3.pdf>

RELEVANT LINKS

- **Event video**
<https://bit.ly/3B2NaYF>