

OFFICIAL FEEDBACK FORM

DIALOGUE DATE	Friday, 26 February 2021 13:00 GMT -05:00
DIALOGUE TITLE	Food Insecurity
CONVENED BY	Arrell Food Institute at the University of Guelph
DIALOGUE EVENT PAGE	https://summitdialogues.org/dialogue/5123/
DIALOGUE TYPE	Independent
GEOGRAPHICAL FOCUS	Canada

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

19-30

31-50

51-65

66-80

80+

PARTICIPATION BY GENDER

Male

Female

Prefer not to say or Other

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS IN EACH SECTOR

Agriculture/crops

18

Education

Health care

Fish and aquaculture

1

Communication

1

Nutrition

Livestock

2

Food processing

10

National or local government

Agro-forestry

1

Food retail, markets

Utilities

Environment and ecology

2

Food industry

Industrial

Trade and commerce

Financial Services

16

Other

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS FROM EACH STAKEHOLDER GROUP

Small/medium enterprise/artisan

Workers and trade union

3

Large national business

1

Member of Parliament

Multi-national corporation

Local authority

Small-scale farmer

10

Government and national institution

Medium-scale farmer

Regional economic community

Large-scale farmer

United Nations

15 Local Non-Governmental Organization

International financial institution

International Non-Governmental Organization

1

Private Foundation / Partnership / Alliance

Indigenous People

Consumer group

18 Science and academia

3

Other

2. PRINCIPLES OF ENGAGEMENT

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

The Dialogues were organized following the Food Summit Principles of Engagement, where a diverse set of stakeholders had the opportunity to engage in purposeful and respectful exchanges to discuss concrete actions for transforming food systems. Care was taken in the recruitment of participants to have a balance of food system actors present at the Dialogue. In his framing remarks, the Dialogue Curator reinforced the Principles of Engagement, and participants were able to gain of understanding of how the ideas generated throughout the Dialogue would feed into the UN Food Systems Summit. Following opening remark to frame the discussions, participants joined facilitated break-out discussions. Members of the Arrell Food Institute team attended the Curator and Convenor training, and many facilitators attended the training offered by the Summit Dialogues team as well.

HOW DID YOUR DIALOGUE REFLECT SPECIFIC ASPECTS OF THE PRINCIPLES?

A large focus of the Dialogue was ensuring multi-stakeholder inclusivity, which was reflected in the diverse set of participants who attended the dialogue. Attracting over 50 participants, the delegates included farmers, researchers, politicians, policy makers, restaurateurs, and NGO representatives. As guided by the facilitators via discussion questions, participants discussed concrete action points and solutions for food system challenges, and the entire Dialogue followed Chatham House Rules so that participants would feel comfortable with sharing their opinions.

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

The advice for other Dialogue Convenors would be to make sure to take advantage of all the resources offered by the Summit Dialogue team, especially the comprehensive Curator and Facilitator trainings. The reference manual offered online is also key resource for gaining understanding of the Summit Principles of Engagement.

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

Ahead of the upcoming United Nations Food Systems Summit, Arrell Food Institute at the University of Guelph hosted three independent Food System Dialogues to bring together voices from across and beyond the Canadian Food System. The second dialogue explored the root causes of food insecurity. There were 5 discussion groups in this Dialogue, all of whom discussed one of these three topics:

- Reducing poverty in Canada by 50% by 2030, with an equal reduction in food insecurity
- The disproportionate impact of food insecurity on BIPOC populations, and meaningful progress towards BIPOC populations’ food sovereignty, reflecting cultural, ecological and economic interests
- A Canadian universal school nutrition program that also promotes food literacy

Framing speakers:
Suzanne Barr Chef and Food Activist
Paul Taylor, Executive Director, Food Share Toronto
Evan Fraser, AFI Director

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 |

MAIN FINDINGS

Canada should commit to reducing food insecurity in our country by 50% by 2030. To measure progress towards this target, we must create a national framework to measure food insecurity.

Food justice is a poverty issue with links to health, education, and community building. Further, food insecurity finds its roots in structural racism and colonialism. Initiatives to address this include school nutrition programs, income floors and other forms of social protection that guarantee every Canadian has a basic standard of living. While funding for these programs can emerge from federal investments, the specifics of any program need to be tailored to community-specific solutions. This links to UNFSS Action Tracks 1 and 2.

Major global trends linked with population growth, climate change, new consumer expectations and novel technologies suggest that the next 10 years may be incredibly disruptive for food systems everywhere. In Canada, we have much to celebrate: our producers are amongst the most environmentally conscious in the world, most Canadians enjoy safe, healthy, and affordable food year-round. Nevertheless, systemic problems of food insecurity and disruptions to the food system caused by the pandemic mean that we need to do better. Together, by working to empower communities to develop locally-relevant programs to address the root causes of food insecurity we can ensure Canada has the tools it needs to continue having one of the greatest food systems in the world. This will not only help support domestic producers and consumers as well as allowing those parts of our food system that depend on exporting to international markets thrive and expand over the next generation.

ACTION TRACKS

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

KEYWORDS

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

OUTCOMES FOR EACH DISCUSSION TOPIC

- Food insecurity is a poverty issue
- Structural racism exists within food access
- Different communities need different things
- Food banks need support and are only helping those who are severely food insecure – not a long-term solution
- Labour rights/workers rights must be considered, not just welfare or charity approach
- Data, properly disaggregated, to benchmark and measure impact is crucial
- School nutrition (education and food supply) is a vital part of this

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

While there were active discussions where divergent views were shared, each group was able to come to a general consensus at the end of their breakout.

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 |

ATTACHMENTS AND RELEVANT LINKS

ATTACHMENTS

- <https://summitdialogues.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/Food-Systems-Summit-Dialogue-Report-1.pdf>