

OFFICIAL FEEDBACK FORM

DIALOGUE DATE	Monday, 12 July 2021 11:04 GMT +03:00
DIALOGUE TITLE	Agroecology for Sustainable Food Systems
CONVENED BY	Agroecology Hub In Tanzania-AEHT
DIALOGUE EVENT PAGE	https://summitdialogues.org/dialogue/34287/
DIALOGUE TYPE	Independent
GEOGRAPHICAL FOCUS	United Republic of Tanzania

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

0-18	5	19-30	24	31-50	13	51-65	1	66-80	80+
------	---	-------	----	-------	----	-------	---	-------	-----

PARTICIPATION BY GENDER

33	Male	10	Female		Prefer not to say or Other
----	------	----	--------	--	----------------------------

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS IN EACH SECTOR

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

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS FROM EACH STAKEHOLDER GROUP

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

2. PRINCIPLES OF ENGAGEMENT

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

The Independent Dialogue was organized as a contribution to the Food Systems Summit and to the elaboration of pathways to food systems transformation contributing to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. It ultimately meant to come up with ideas to protect and/or improve the health and well-being of individuals, enhance resilient livelihoods and promote good stewardship of natural resources, while respecting local cultures and contexts. The Dialogue built on the existing policy processes and initiatives while trying to provide an avenue to connect stakeholders and broaden partnerships to transform food systems. Members of the dialogue are forward-looking to the emergence of ways to move forward collectively and creatively, embracing the entire scope of ideas to contribute to the vision, objectives, and the final outcomes of the Food Systems Summit. Despite the fact that the team was composed of varied stakeholders from different sectors, yet participants were coordinated such that each had to listen to each other and be open to the co-existence of divergent points of view. Members jointly worked while focusing on promoting good stewardship of natural resources and thinking of ways to respect local cultures and contexts. We favorably looked at the existence of policies and practices that strive to protect and improve the health and well-being of individuals, enhance resilient livelihoods and communities.

HOW DID YOUR DIALOGUE REFLECT SPECIFIC ASPECTS OF THE PRINCIPLES?

Being complex and closely connected to, and significantly impact upon; human and animal health, land, water, climate, biodiversity, the economy, and other systems, thus, food systems transformation requires a joint approach. As such, the dialogue embraced the complexity of the food systems by involving multiple stakeholders to identify actions across the system together with potential synergies and trade-offs. The Dialogue brought 44 participants to the table diverse stakeholders from within the Government ministries, Non-stake actors/NGOs, and farmer organizations including Farmer Research Networks, academic and research institutions, and media representing many more other stakeholders working across the food systems from production to consumption. Stakeholders were inclusive and strived to showcase as many voices as possible, capturing diverse cultural, professional, and gender-specific perspectives. Their voices are clearly captured in the Dialogue feedback. Evidently, we supported inclusive multi-stakeholder processes and approaches within governments and communities that bring in diverse perspectives to enable stakeholders to find alignment through understanding and designing of policy options that deliver against multiple public goods and across these various systems. The Dialogue was curated and facilitated in a way that promoted trust and encourages mutual respect. Thus, conclusions shared here are not attributed to single individuals rather emanate from thorough discussions from groups of people with varied knowledge and experience.

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

Yes, they should observe the principles of engagement during the Dialogue, since, for example, adhering to these principles; they will reap the fruits of diversity which enriches and strengthens common understanding of the phenomenon in question. Diversity in discussion is very important, since each participant will bring different knowledge and experiences, and probably different cultures, beliefs, and values to enrich the discussion. Diversity can also create opportunities for growth and better connection in person, and or social achievements. Other principles emphasize on strength-based approaches are a key principle of inclusive discussions. They distinguish each participant as having inherent strengths and talents which could be a catalyst for positive thinking in a particular discussion. So, we may celebrate diversity and differences among participants in facilitating opportunities for personalized knowledge. Seeking the perspectives of participants ensures they make a meaningful contribution to their knowledge and experience. The ability to have a voice influences both their knowledge as participants and their agency too. It should be noted that; the process of facilitation should be consultative and participants should be active rather than passive on matters that directly affect them. Knowing this it triggers us to There is also a need to consider the principle of listening, which emphasizes the belief in participants' capabilities, and the need to develop relationships of trust and respect. Moreover, when participants are given a platform to share their voices, there is a better understanding of their experience and as a result, we get a clear message that participant engagement is important. However, all in all, facilitators must be fully committed to including all participants. Inclusive facilitation needs commitment, knowledge, and practical skills. An inclusive discussion is one where participants of all capabilities have the opportunity to contribute their views.

3. METHOD

The outcomes of a Dialogue are influenced by the method that is used.

DID YOU USE THE SAME METHOD AS RECOMMENDED BY THE CONVENORS REFERENCE MANUAL?

Yes

No

4. DIALOGUE FOCUS & OUTCOMES

MAJOR FOCUS

The Dialogue touched almost all the five objectives/action tracks listed below;

- 1) Ensuring Access to Safe and Nutritious Food for All (enabling all people to be well-nourished and healthy)
- 2) Shifting to Sustainable Consumption Patterns (promoting and creating demand for healthy and sustainable diets, reducing waste)
- 3) Boosting Nature-Positive Production at Sufficient Scales (acting on climate change, reducing emissions and increasing carbon capture, regenerating and protecting critical ecosystems, and reducing food loss and energy usage, without undermining health or nutritious diets)
- 4) Advancing Equitable Livelihoods and Value Distribution (raising incomes, distributing risk, expanding inclusion, creating jobs)
- 5) Building Resilience to Vulnerabilities, Shocks, and Stresses (ensuring the continued functionality of healthy and sustainable food systems)

2. Aim and Objectives

In light of the above, the Dialogue aimed at creating the opportunity for stakeholders in agroecology to interact and deliberate on the role agroecology should play in realizing sustainable food systems in Tanzania by focusing on the following themes: research, policy, capacity building, and dissemination.

1. RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, POLICY, TRAINING, AND EXTENSION CLUSTER

- i. Indicate the needs, or otherwise for changes in current agriculture (2013) and livestock (2006) policies that can help advocate for AEI in the next 3 – 5 years period,
- ii. Determine the nature of support that AEI would be availed to agroecology practitioners along the value chain,
- iii. Going forward, indicate how training and extension services would need to be re-engineered to accommodate stakeholders' needs for Agroecology Intensification-(AEI), and
- iv. Identify which other issues need special consideration to support AEI, where appropriate, in Tanzania.

2. TANZANIA RESEARCH INSTITUTE-TARI/TANZANIA LIVESTOCK RESEARCH INSTITUTE-TALIRI/SOKOINE UNIVERSITY OF AGRICULTURE-SUA cluster

Determine strategic interventions that would ensure an inclusive research agenda that incorporates the needs of both resource-limited and large scale entities in line with AEI,

- (i) Which approach would help fast-track research and technology generation relevant to AEI?
- (ii) Do we have information on stakeholder needs for AEI?
 - a) If the answer is yes, elaborate on the cause(s) for failure to generate and/or disseminate relevant technologies for AEI on a wider scale, and
 - b) If the answer is no, propose an approach(es) and procedure(s) for the identification of research priority areas for AEI that are likely to give an impact in the immediate and long terms in different agroecological zones.
- (iii) Given the impact of climate change in some areas, what do you see as the role of research to address emerging issues along the value chain to help streamline research priority areas for AEI, and
- (iv) Can one say that there is a need to re-define 'agroecological zonation' in order to realistically target research efforts in potential high impact areas for Agroecology Intensification?, and
- (v) Determine what other issues need special consideration to support technology generation for AEI in Tanzania.

(3) NGOs/FRNs CLUSTER

- i. Identify AEI practices (technologies) adopted widely by farmers (for production, processing, or marketing/trade) in your area (NGO/FRN) that provide evidence for increased agricultural (crop and/or livestock) productivity
- ii. Determine how advocacy activities on AEI resonate with the current agriculture and livestock development policies,
- iii. Who and/or which organizations and/or institutions should actively participate in advocacy and out-scaling of AEI technologies and which specific roles should be played by each,
- iv. Determine the current gaps in extension on AEI and the training needs for extension/outreach activities geared towards AEI at the grass-root level,
- v. Identify policy and strategic bottlenecks hindering widespread adoption of AEI practices in Tanzania, and
- vi. Determine which other issues need special consideration to support technology generation and dissemination for AEI in Tanzania.

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

Issues that featured strongly during group discussion and plenary session are as follows;

1. Lack of defined markets of AE products
2. The existing policies are inclined towards conventional agriculture
3. Lack of political will to support smallholder farmers to adopt agroecology
4. Uncoordinated efforts among agroecology stakeholders at inter and intra levels
5. Lack of strategies for promoting the use of bio-inputs (e.g. bio-pesticides) and native seeds
6. Ineffective extension services

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

THEME 1: Policy on Research and Development, Training and Extension

The National Agriculture Policy, 2013 recognizes organic agriculture but not agroecology although some of its practices are addressed. Also, in relation to agroecological intensification, the National Livestock Policy of 2006 does not specifically address absolute issues in agroecology. However, it points out some issues of concern for agroecology. Furthermore, the Plant Health Act (2020) has provisions for licensing bio-input suppliers. It is, however, noted that this legislation is yet to become operational pending the completion and sanctioning of Regulations that would spell out details on procedures and processes for operationalization of the law.

What to do?

- Training & extension should focus on the coexistence of conventional and agroecology knowledge
- TARI and other research institutions should recognize and participate in AE related research
- Effectively coordinate AE stakeholders by agroecology Hub in Tanzania.
- Promote dissemination of AE technologies and knowledge to the community level through ICTs
- Promote production by farmers of market-led AE products
- Publicize AE products through various methods including media
- Advocate strongly for AE through various methods including media

Theme 2: TARI/TALIRI/SUA cluster

Strategies for promoting AE Research

- AE research should form part of the mandate of TARI and other research institutions
- Technology transfer units should develop mechanisms for the dissemination of technologies on Agroecological Intensification (AEI)
- Adopt participatory programs in identifying AE technologies in collaboration with farmers and other stakeholders
- Agroecology Hub in Tanzania and the Ministry of Agriculture (Lead Ministry) should prepare a document containing a variety of agroecology technologies relevant to specific geographical areas/regions in the country.
- Revise the National agricultural research agenda (NARA) to incorporate agroecology issues.
- Mapping of research needs for generating appropriate AE technologies.

THEME 3: NGOs/FRNs cluster (.

Key issues identified

- NGOs are weak in advocating for evidence-based AE sensitive agriculture and livestock policies
- Poor documentation of challenges to the existing policies
- Lack of training of extension staff on AE
- Lack of extension approach towards AEI at various levels including at grass root level
- Extension staff are implementing their duties based on existing government policies and programs which are inclined towards conventional agriculture
- Existing policies do not adequately capture AE issues
- Low ratio of extension staff to farmers
- Extension officers undertake activities other than extension work

What to do?

- Revise curricula in technical training institutions to include agroecology
- Conduct refreshers training on AE for in-service extension staff
- Promote a positive attitude towards AE
- Establish platforms for coordination of AE stakeholders (Agroecology Hub in Tanzania-AEHT)
- Promote use of participatory approach involving various stakeholders (e.g. researchers, policymakers, agro-dealers, and producers) in advocacy and out-scaling of AEI technologies
- Identify policy and strategic bottlenecks hindering widespread adoption of AEI practices in Tanzania

ACTION TRACKS

- ✓ Action Track 1: Ensure access to safe and nutritious food for all
- ✓ Action Track 2: Shift to sustainable consumption patterns
- ✓ Action Track 3: Boost nature-positive production
- ✓ Action Track 4: Advance equitable livelihoods
- ✓ Action Track 5: Build resilience to vulnerabilities, shocks and stress

KEYWORDS

- | | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------|
| ✓ Finance | ✓ Policy |
| ✓ Innovation | Data & Evidence |
| Human rights | ✓ Governance |
| ✓ Women & Youth Empowerment | ✓ Trade-offs |
| | ✓ Environment and Climate |

AREAS OF DIVERGENCE

Generally, there is no striking divergence in terms of observation regarding issues discussed during the plenary. In fact, groups of participants had similar views on various issues discussed. To some degree, participants had disputes about whether or not there should be an emphasis on the use of industrial/chemical inputs to 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