

OFFICIAL FEEDBACK FORM

DIALOGUE DATE	Thursday, 9 September 2021 13:30 GMT +08:00
DIALOGUE TITLE	Building Resilient Local Food Systems by 2030
CONVENED BY	International Institute of Rural Reconstruction (IIRR), Philippine Society of Nutritionist-Dietitians (PSND), Inc., Philippine Coalition of Advocates for Nutrition Security, SUN-Civil Society Alliance Philippines, & PROLINNOVA Philippines Country Platform
DIALOGUE EVENT PAGE	https://summitdialogues.org/dialogue/39540/
DIALOGUE TYPE	Independent
GEOGRAPHICAL FOCUS	Philippines

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

81

PARTICIPATION BY AGE RANGE

1 0-18 32 19-30 31 31-50 14 51-65 3 66-80 0 80+

PARTICIPATION BY GENDER

17 Male 63 Female 1 Prefer not to say or Other

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS IN EACH SECTOR

30	Agriculture/crops	7	Education	3	Health care
2	Fish and aquaculture	2	Communication	20	Nutrition
	Livestock		Food processing	3	National or local government
	Agro-forestry		Food retail, markets		Utilities
	Environment and ecology	3	Food industry		Industrial
1	Trade and commerce	1	Financial Services		Other

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS FROM EACH STAKEHOLDER GROUP

4	Small/medium enterprise/artisan		Workers and trade union
1	Large national business		Member of Parliament
1	Multi-national corporation	1	Local authority
14	Small-scale farmer	14	Government and national institution
1	Medium-scale farmer		Regional economic community
	Large-scale farmer		United Nations
11	Local Non-Governmental Organization		International financial institution
12	International Non-Governmental Organization	5	Private Foundation / Partnership / Alliance
	Indigenous People	5	Consumer group
7	Science and academia	5	Other

2. PRINCIPLES OF ENGAGEMENT

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

The UNFSS principles of engagement were applied in the design of the methodology, program flow, and selection of participants. Through member organizations of Scaling Up Nutrition-Civil Society Alliance Philippines (SUN-CSA PH), pre-dialogue focused group discussions were conducted with farmers, fisherfolks, and women's groups in select municipalities. This enabled us to hear and gather insights from grassroots stakeholders even if only one or two of them could share their outputs at the virtual dialogue due to poor internet connection and technology barriers. Research and extension workers and program implementers joined the grassroots group representatives at the virtual dialogue. Around 61% of attendees work in the agriculture and nutrition sector where they represent various stakeholder groups, like small to medium scale farmers, small to multi-national businesses, local and international NGOs, academe, government institutions, private foundations and alliances, consumers, and the youth from rural, peri-urban, and urban localities. The main virtual dialogue included two technical presentations on: 1) food security and malnutrition problems in the Philippines; and 2) local data on food system drivers like socio-demography, economic situation, and access to agricultural input supply. These gave context to the ensuing discussions and emphasized the urgent need for collaborative actions to build more resilient local food systems. In the breakout discussions, participants talked, without prejudice, about the food system shocks and stresses they experienced related to climate change and Covid-19. Guide questions were designed to solicit local adaptation and mitigation strategies to combat these stressors and shocks with respect to local knowledge, context, and culture-specific innovations. Participants were asked of their commitments to help build resilient food systems in the next two to three years. They also identified existing partnerships, platforms, policies, and champions they could tap to pursue their commitment to build on the work of others.

HOW DID YOUR DIALOGUE REFLECT SPECIFIC ASPECTS OF THE PRINCIPLES?

The Dialogue methods and invitation list were designed to be more socially inclusive of grassroots stakeholders who are often left behind in global events like this. We invited participants from a wide array of social, professional, and gender backgrounds to broaden the perspective during their discussion. The guide questions during the dialogue built the discussion towards what we can do in the immediate future to build more resilient food systems based on the lessons we have gained from our current food system stressors and shocks. It also served as a platform for grassroots stakeholders and professional development workers to learn of existing local innovations of other sectors and connect with other stakeholders for food systems transformative actions. Facilitators of the breakout discussions were oriented to be open and respectful of the different ideas that were shared by the participants. There were instances of varying opinions raised during the discussions but they were all heard and acknowledged. To minimize misunderstanding, the facilitators discussed definitions of common terms related to the respective groups they were facilitating. Participants were also encouraged to share their innovations/programs, especially their challenges, reflections, and learnings.

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

It may be best to limit the discussion guide questions to two or three only, and the breakout session to 60 minutes, to give more time for plenary open forum. The open forum facilitator in the plenary should also be able to float discussion starter questions, based on what each group presented. These will give more space for initiating new partnerships across stakeholder groups. Invest time and resources to engage grassroots stakeholders and marginalized groups like women and youth via methodologies accessible to them. Make an effort to engage them since they may be shy to speak up, especially in a virtual dialogue. Although it is more tedious, they are among the fundamental actors of our complex food systems from which small positive changes could start and be scaled up; and, because they are the most vulnerable and severely affected by disruptions in our food systems. In the discussion groups, it is helpful to have one facilitator and a separate note taker to ensure that everything shared are captured – whether verbally or through the chat box. It is also helpful if the facilitator understands the local dialect of some of the delegates to enable them to express themselves in the language they are comfortable in. With Covid-19 still a major threat in most parts of the world, doing a blended style of dialogues may be considered to ensure safety and still maintain inclusivity. A virtual dialogue allows people from different parts of the country to participate, even though internet connection and facilities may be limiting. Therefore, there must be room for flexibility and provision of support for them. A face-to-face dialogue is especially helpful for grassroots stakeholders and it would be more helpful to have the support of their local government or local leaders when organizing the dialogue.

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 followed the recommended method but made some alterations. We also held a face-to-face focused group discussions (FGDs) with farmers, fisherfolks, and women's groups in select municipalities. Conducted before the main dialogue, the FGDs were facilitated by member organizations of SUN-CSA PH: the Adventist Development and Relief Agency, Action Against Hunger, and International Institute of Rural Reconstruction. In the FGDs, participants watched a short video clip on Food Systems for Healthier Diets or did a reflection exercise to understand the Food System concept and their roles in the food system. Vulnerability, stress, shocks, and resilience were explained in the local language to set a common understanding. The UNFSS processes and objectives were also explained using the template from the Summit website. In 60 minutes, the participants discussed the following: 1) WHAT are the shocks and stress you've experienced and HOW were you affected by these? 2) HOW did you adapt to or mitigate these vulnerabilities, shocks, and stress? 3) HOW, in your capacity, can you contribute to building resilience to vulnerabilities, shocks, and stress? 4) HOW could the government help to complement your existing innovations or proposed actions? Insights were collected as the grassroots stakeholders reflected on issues and their innovations. Three of them were selected to join the main dialogue. The main dialogue was convened by IIRR, in partnership with the Philippine Society of Nutritionist-Dietitians, Inc. (PSND), Philippine Coalition of Advocates for Nutrition Security (PhilCAN), SUN-CSA PH, and the PROLINNOVA Philippines Country Platform (PROLINNOVA). It was held virtually due to Covid-19 restrictions. Representatives from the youth, farmer and fisherfolk groups, research, extension and program implementors, and women's groups were invited. In the main dialogue, the Philippines' vulnerability to disruptions caused by climate change and the COVID-19 pandemic were explained. Hence, the dialogue focused on building local food systems resilient to such issues. The importance of engaging grassroots stakeholders was also emphasized since they are part of the smaller, local food systems that comprise the country's complex food system. Three 10-minute presentations discussed the following: 1) the Food System Summit process and its five action tracks; 2) impacts of climate change and COVID-19 to our food system, and the economic and nutrition situation of the country before and during the pandemic; and 3) local data on socio-economic situation and access to agricultural input supply in select municipalities. The speakers urged that actions on the ground are more important than hundreds of dialogues combined. These presentations gave context for the discussions and called for the urgent need to collaborate to change how our food system is shaping, and redirect it to build resilience. The participants were then divided into four discussion groups: 1) Research, Extension and Program Implementers; 2) Farmers & Fisherfolks; 3) Women; and 4) Youth. Eighty minutes were allotted to discuss two sets of questions: Set 1 revolved around the questions discussed in the pre-dialogue FGDs and set 2 asked participants to identify a realistic commitment their organizations can make to help build the resilience of our food systems in the next two to three years. They were also asked to think of existing partnerships, platforms, policies, and champions they could tap to jumpstart their commitments. IIRR pitched for collaboration in its Gulayan sa Barangay (Nutrition-sensitive Community Food Production) Movement. The groups shared their outputs during the open forum. The moderator synthesized the current challenges and disruptions in our food systems into a framework (ANNEX 1) and cited some of the resounding commitments from the stakeholder groups. The framework emphasized that our food system could produce either positive or negative outcomes. Our commitments to help improve our resilience and scale out resilience-building innovations could help shape our food system towards sustainability and positive outcomes for the people, planet, and economy.

4. DIALOGUE FOCUS & OUTCOMES

MAJOR FOCUS

The Dialogue was designed to catalyze discussion on how to build food systems resilience specifically against climate change and COVID-19-related stressors and shocks. Nonetheless, we also documented disruptions of other nature voiced out by the participants.

The following are the top stressors and shocks frequently brought up across the different stakeholder groups, arranged from the most frequently mentioned:

1. Strong Typhoons
2. Disruptions in inputs and market supply due to COVID-19 related travel ban
 - 1.1. Unemployment and business/operations shutdowns resulting from various COVID-19-related restrictions
 - 1.2. Increased availability of highly processed foods from food aid and local markets (including and breastmilk substitutes from food donations)
 - 1.3. Insufficient post-harvest storage and transportation facilities
 - 1.4. Food insecurity brought by Covid-19
 - 1.5. Insufficient supply of breastmilk for babies in key places like hospitals
 - 1.6. Climate change affecting food production
 - 4.1. Flooding
 - 4.2. Landslide
 - 4.3. Drought
 - 4.4. Market sale and inputs price surges
 - 4.5. Soil erosion and degradation resulting from unsustainable farming practices
 - 4.6. Landlessness
 - 4.7. Land conversion
 - 4.8. Poverty

Delegates from various parts of the country reckon experiencing more and increasingly stronger typhoons. They expressed that it destroys crops and livelihoods, undermining their efforts to produce and sell food, as well as community food production efforts like school gardening. It also impedes the transport of goods from one place to another. Along with degradation of natural resources, typhoons also damage fish breeding grounds through increased siltation.

Participants also said that the COVID-19 community quarantine protocols disrupted supply chains. This exacerbated fluctuations in prices of inputs and commodities, especially fresh, perishable foods. As prices of goods increased, the purchasing power and access of consumers, especially for nutritious food, decreased due to sales losses, closure of businesses, and increased unemployment also resulting from the COVID-19 restrictions. Together with increased availability of highly processed foods and breastmilk substitutes from food aid and local markets, vulnerable groups are pushed further towards unhealthy and unsustainable consumption. Service delivery, research and humanitarian implementation were also hampered. All of these compounded and led to more people suffering from food insecurity, worsening health and nutrition status.

Other food system stressors and shocks mentioned, although less prominently, include:

- I. Geophysical/meteorological
 - Changes in seasonal patterns
 - Red tide
 - Taal Volcano eruption
 - Loss of agricultural livelihoods
- II. Human-induced
 - Disruption in research and data collection
 - Separation of mother to infant due to confusing COVID-19 health protocols
 - Marine habitat destruction
 - Natural resource degradation
 - Overfishing
 - Conflict of business sector interest with breastfeeding promotion
 - Change in socio-political leaders
 - Trade policies favorable to influx of cheaper, imported food products (specifically coffee)
 - Massive corruption
 - Urbanization
 - Spread of misinformation in social media; insufficient knowledge of general populace on food, nutrition, and sustainability
 - Weak local government support on nutrition and agricultural needs (e.g., breastfeeding promotion and mainstreaming, farmers' needs)
 - Social discrimination (e.g., marginalization of farmers from market actors like middlemen, unequal access of women agricultural entrepreneurs to loans)

- Armed conflict
 - Insufficient Irrigation infrastructure
 - Consumer preference for imported vegetables
- III. Biological
- African Swine Flu

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

- | | | | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Finance | <input type="checkbox"/> | Policy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Innovation | <input type="checkbox"/> | Data & Evidence |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Human rights | ✓ | Governance |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Women & Youth Empowerment | ✓ | Trade-offs |
| | | ✓ | Environment and Climate |

MAIN FINDINGS

Despite being in varying sectors, the commitments of the delegates fell under the following similar tracks:

I. Train others to scale out resilience-building strategies and innovations:

A. Climate-Smart Agriculture/Aquaculture (CSA)

Delegates committed to scale out in their communities their innovations to adapt to climate change and COVID-19 impacts on our food systems. 1-Basiao Oyster and Mussel Fisherfolks Association (BOFA) committed to continue training other fisherfolks on the Raft Method - a climate-smart way of growing oysters. Samahang Magsasaka ng Barangay San Pedro 1, Sikap Coffee, Yakap at Halik Multi-Purpose Cooperative (YHMPC), and farmer-scientist Mr. Ed Silan also expressed their commitment to train fellow farmers on CSA practices such as crop and livestock diversification, rainwater collection, organic farming, and to keep their farms open for benchmarking visits. Sikap Coffee will continue facilitating learning exchanges with coffee farmers on new technologies for post-harvest processing of coffee.

B. Community Savings and Credit Associations (COMSCA)

COMSCA membership helped grassroots stakeholders develop financial resilience. It gives them access to loans to expand their livelihoods or recover from asset loss. The members of Samahang Magsasaka ng Barangay San Pedro 1 and the Barangay United Loans and Savings Association (BULSA) committed to invite more community members to join their COMSCA groups. Currently, BULSA members are mostly women but they expressed intent to invite men and youth as well.

C. Exclusive breastfeeding (EBF)

EBF is a healthy and sustainable practice within the food system. Support groups like Breastfeeding Bicolanas, LATCH Los Baños, and Breastfeeding Care Center of the North (BCCN) commit to continue capacity-building activities and online learning-sharing exchanges among mothers on lactation and/or re-lactation practices. LATCH Los Baños is securing a long-term partnership with the Provincial Government of Laguna and the University of the Philippines-Los Baños (UPLB) to jointly implement Project BREAST (Breastfeeding as Response to Emergencies made more Accessible through Science and Technology) to jumpstart emergency-Infant and Young Child Feeding Practices (IYCF). They will conduct a province-wide training and re-training of community nutrition and health workers on proper IYCF during emergencies, including strengthening the local Human Milk bank they have established in Los Baños.

II. Continue advocacy and awareness raising efforts on sustainable food production and consumption practices
Youth organizations such as Slow Food Youth Network Philippines, Girl Scouts of the Philippines (GSP), OurND, and Masagana EcoFarms committed to continue efforts to promote and raise awareness on good nutrition habits, agrobiodiversity conservation, Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), and awareness and understanding of our Food Systems. They plan to do so via social media campaigns, podcasts, personalized dietary counselling, mainstreaming locally available vegetables in menus offered, and other platforms. The commitment of GSP to raise awareness on Food Systems somehow matches the expressed need of some of the participants from the women and mother support groups – they hope there is a “one-stop shop” or repository where they can learn more about Food Systems and access relevant local-level data.

The youth representatives from the Philippine Association of Nutrition & 4H Club committed to promote availment of needs-based health and nutrition extension services, and agro-entrepreneurship trainings offered by local governments, respectively.

III. Conserve and propagate climate-resilient, local crops

Women and farmer groups like First Pirico Farmer’s Association (FPFA), BULSA, YHMPC, and Farmer Scientists all expressed commitment to conserve and propagate climate-resilient, local crops by establishing community seed banks or Crop Museums in partnership with local governments, state colleges and universities, and NGOs. A Crop Museum is a decentralized nursery of climate-smart and nutrient-dense local vegetables that also serves as a learning hub for agrobiodiversity conservation.

IV. Partnership building and collaboration with local government agencies and other organizations

Almost all participating groups expressed they will explore and strengthen partnership with local governments and organizations to scale out their adaptation strategies. FPFA and the farmer COMSCA Group from Kidapawan, North Cotabato committed to partner with a local cooperative and the Office of Municipal Agriculturist (OMA) to expand their vegetable home gardening and tree planting activities. Samahang Magsasaka ng Barangay San Pedro 1 will partner with OMA to raise more resources for their community-shared facilities for raising native pigs while Modern Nanays of Mindanao commits to pursue its initial discussions with ThinkWell Institute about convening the various breastfeeding support groups in the Philippines.

The Youth group announced plans to formally organize the dialogue’s youth delegates into a network of youth advocates for nutrition and sustainable food systems. They boldly called for other stakeholder groups who want to partner with them and support their committed actions. A few youth groups also committed to continue efforts to reduce food waste by collecting aesthetically rejected fresh produce and using it for community pantries and soup kitchens. BCCN also committed to continue serving as a watchdog to uphold the breastfeeding rights of women and children.

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

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Finance | <input 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 |

OUTCOMES FOR EACH DISCUSSION TOPIC - 1/2

The participants mentioned a lot of food system shocks and stresses they experienced in recent years but they were able to develop adaptation and mitigation innovations to build their resilience.

Climate change-related food system shocks & stresses usually damage the participants' livelihoods and assets and hampers transport of their produce, leading to fluctuations in price and supply of inputs and commodities. They adapted through the following:

- Adoption of Climate-smart agriculture and aquaculture practices such as:
 - Planting windbreak trees
 - Livelihood diversification with low and high-value aquafarming products and climate-resilient crops (like root & tuber crops)
 - Installation of seawater exit canals towards the greater open water to let the algae (causing red tide) out of the fishing and aquaculture zones
 - Mulching and raised planting beds
 - Mangrove and forest rehabilitation
 - Use of organic fertilizer and pesticides
- Installation of drainage slots and mini-dam or mini-impounding to control excess rain water and serve as water source during drought
- Development of climate change mitigation plans
- Accessing credit/loans from COMSCA groups
- Establishment of community vermiculture and composting facilities
- Organizing community members into support groups, farmer learning groups, or environmental stewards' group
- Propagation and consumption of climate-resilient indigenous vegetables
- Selling of high-value aquaculture products to local consumers (albeit at a lower cost than export price)

The COVID-19 pandemic also affected our local food systems such as disruption in supply chains, closure of businesses resulting in unemployment, hampered school, health service, and research operations, limited food access due to quarantine protocols, etc. The participants adapted by:

- Promoting and setting up community and backyard/home food gardening and promoting local vegetables for better food access amidst emergency situations and rapid urbanization
- Offering free online trainings/webinars and disseminating information materials on nutrition, livelihood activities, entrepreneurship, agripreneurship, breastfeeding, misconceptions about indigenous foods
- Setting up community pantries, or mobilizing local resources from general public to raise and distribute locally sourced fresh produce, health & nutrition information and food gardening materials
- Joining and inviting others into COMSCA or microfinance groups to access low-interest credit
- Collecting and re-distributing/donating excess food to impoverished communities
- Offering trainings on post-harvest processing technologies to reduce food waste
- Direct purchasing from farmers and fisherfolks through online platforms to help bridge the food supply chain gaps brought by the travel restrictions and market closures
- Setting up of human milk community depots: milk-sharing for infants needing breast milk supplementation and counselling for recipient families
- Follow evidence-based Maternal & IYCF practices during emergencies
- Meal planning and bulk buying for efficient and easy food preparation
- Transitioning research data collection activities into digital platforms
- Conducted corporate social responsibility activities during the pandemic

Representatives of women and mothers' support groups also raised concerns on human-induced stresses on the "First Food System" – breastfeeding. According to them, business/commercial interests affected nutrition messages. They took the following steps to protect and promote the right of mother and infants to breastfeeding amidst the pandemic and other emergency situations:

- Develop implementing guidelines to uphold adequate nutrition in the First 1000 days
- Strengthen community support and empower families and women on breastfeeding
- Conduct breast milk donation drive
- Network with mother support groups for re-distribution of donated human milk

Some participants also voiced that they perform watchdog roles such as informing the local government on welfare status of communities and exposing corruption and demanding accountability from public officials to contribute in alleviating food system stresses caused by corruption and political issues.

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 - 2/2

Participants from various stakeholder groups expressed how they perceive the government could support and complement their local efforts to build resilience. These are summarized into five key functions:

1. Consolidate, coordinate and scale up good practices

Participants deem it necessary to strengthen partnership with the government for additional support and guidance on their effort to build their resilience against food system shocks and stressors. They consider the government able and appropriate to harmonize and unify the various information management systems so that it is readily available at all levels (local, region, national). The delegates also think it is the role of the government to coordinate the efforts of various organizations working on specific target groups to unify and synergize interventions and prioritize the most vulnerable and reach far flung areas. One example of this is the partnership of LATCH Los Baños with the Provincial Government of Laguna and UPLB to establish community-engaged Human Milk Banks and to mobilize communities to prepare for and handle IYCF during emergencies.

The government is seen as the appropriate institution to establish a platform for effective partnerships to facilitate institutionalization and scaling up of best practices for food system sustainability. There are already many good innovations, systems, and practices being done in the communities and local markets; they just need to be scaled up.

2. Policy and governance

There are a lot of food system drivers that are beyond the control or influence of civil society stakeholders but under the authority of the government. For example, land conversion could be prudently managed through appropriate local government resolutions on land use. Trade and pricing policies hugely affect consumers and food producers, especially when supply of cheap imported alternatives becomes greater than local produce. Participants expressed hope for the government to control the prices of commodities and monitor fake imported products in favor of the consumers and local food producers.

Relevant to the role of the government on scaling up resilience-building strategies, breastfeeding advocates expressed their request for the government to issue a policy on institutionalization of mother support groups in the communities like the policy on ensuring availability of community health and nutrition workers in every barangay.

3. Increase government investment

Various civil society stakeholders also call for increased government investment on health and nutrition services, extension services, and personnel. They think it is appropriate for the government to invest in having "Agriculturist to the Barrios" – agriculture extension workers for every community, especially in last-mile areas.

4. Provision of Inputs, Infrastructure & Capacity Building activities

The delegates perceive the government having a big role in providing essential agricultural infrastructure such as mini-dams, tractors and other heavy equipment. Specifically, they see the LGUs as key actors who can refer farmers in need of government support to national agriculture agencies if only they have a systematic profile of farmers in their municipality or city. This could also help in effective and efficient monitoring of aid given.

The delegates also expressed the need to tap government agencies such as the Department of Trade and Industry (DTI), Science and Technology (DOST), and Technical Education and Skills Development Authority (TESDA) to provide training for livelihoods and financial literacy among farmers and other vulnerable groups.

5. Accountability and transparency

Last but not the least, the delegates clamor for accountability and transparency in our governments decisions and actions relevant to our food 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		Policy
✓	Innovation		Data & Evidence
	Human rights		Governance
✓	Women & Youth Empowerment		Trade-offs
			Environment and Climate

AREAS OF DIVERGENCE

There was no overt "conflict", but it is worth noting that one of the challenges faced by Breastfeeding advocates is the conflict of business sector interest, specifically of companies producing breast milk substitutes (BMS), with that of common good. Aid from BMS companies inevitably promotes BMS products that usually undermines the efforts of breastfeeding advocates to empower and equip women to continue breastfeeding even during emergency situations. The business sector expressed that they have been very active and involved in mitigating the impact of the pandemic on vulnerable groups but there is merit in considering how the BMS distributed, or at least the promotion of the brand, could discourage lactation or uplift the image of BMS over breastmilk. There was no further comment from the business sector on how they plan to align their efforts with the World Health Assembly targets on promoting exclusive breastfeeding for optimum child growth.

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

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

ATTACHMENTS AND RELEVANT LINKS

ATTACHMENTS

- **ANNEX 1 (Attachment to Section 3: Methods)**
<https://summitdialogues.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/UNFSS-Attachment-Annex.png>

RELEVANT LINKS

- **Facebook Video Livestream of the Food Systems Independent Dialogue: Building Resilient Local Food Systems by 2030**
<https://fb.watch/8aRfpOrXDr/>
- **Facebook Events Landing Page Building Resilient Local Food Systems by 2030 (Independent Food Systems Dialogue)**
https://www.facebook.com/events/854925311690298/?active_tab=discussion