

OFFICIAL FEEDBACK FORM

DIALOGUE DATE	Thursday, 27 May 2021 12:30 GMT +02:00
DIALOGUE TITLE	Geographical Indications for a territorial approach to the SDGs
CONVENED BY	This dialogue is convened jointly by Cirad and FAO with the support of oriGIn and of the Swiss Federal Institute of Intellectual Property (Swiss IPI).
DIALOGUE EVENT PAGE	https://summitdialogues.org/dialogue/5389/
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

158

PARTICIPATION BY AGE RANGE

0 0-18 25 19-30 86 31-50 41 51-65 6 66-80 80+

PARTICIPATION BY GENDER

77 Male 81 Female Prefer not to say or Other

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS IN EACH SECTOR

36	Agriculture/crops	54	Education		Health care
	Fish and aquaculture	3	Communication		Nutrition
	Livestock	4	Food processing	19	National or local government
	Agro-forestry	2	Food retail, markets		Utilities
5	Environment and ecology	2	Food industry		Industrial
5	Trade and commerce		Financial Services	27	Other

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS FROM EACH STAKEHOLDER GROUP

	Small/medium enterprise/artisan	2	Workers and trade union
11	Large national business		Member of Parliament
1	Multi-national corporation		Local authority
1	Small-scale farmer	35	Government and national institution
4	Medium-scale farmer	3	Regional economic community
	Large-scale farmer		United Nations
16	Local Non-Governmental Organization		International financial institution
8	International Non-Governmental Organization	3	Private Foundation / Partnership / Alliance
	Indigenous People		Consumer group
74	Science and academia		Other

2. PRINCIPLES OF ENGAGEMENT

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

- Act with Urgency: our Independent Dialogue was organized to consider 2030 as a time horizon to which Geographical Indications could contribute as a territorial approach to the SDGs. - Commit to the Summit: we ensured a very large recruitment of participants (158 registrations), from 51 countries of the world, invited and participating in a personal capacity and committed to a territorial approach of food systems for greater sustainability. - Be respectful + Build trust: in order to offer a confidential and friendly discussion space, our Dialogue organized, after a plenary session (30 min), 9 parallel discussion sessions, of 8 to 10 people each (1h30), followed by a feedback in plenary session (30 min). All discussions were held under the Chatham House rules. - Recognize the complexity: each thematic session was introduced by a moment of shared assessment whose objective was to recognize the complexity of the subject. This was followed by a prospective phase of building solutions, adapted to the issues / gaps identified in the first part of the dialogue. - Embrace multi-stakeholder inclusiveness: in our independent dialogue, we paid particular attention to promoting diverse participation. Participant statistics show that we met the challenge of a multi-stakeholder approach.

HOW DID YOUR DIALOGUE REFLECT SPECIFIC ASPECTS OF THE PRINCIPLES?

In its conclusions, our Independent Dialogue on "Geographical Indications for a Territorial Approach to the SDGs" reflects a recognition of the complexity of the issues related to more sustainable food systems. These exchanges have also allowed us to identify feasible, sustainable and fundable solutions in the short and medium term. These solutions involve a wide range of actors. It seems to us that we have worked in the direction of the principles of this dialogue. Translated with www.DeepL.com/Translator (free version)

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

The Principles of Engagement are very useful guidelines for organizing independent dialogues, from the general framing of your topics to the small logistical details.

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

This independent dialogue focused on “Geographical Indications for a territorial approach to the SDGs”. This is relevant in the context of Action Track 4, “Advancing Equitable Livelihoods” and more specifically for Action Area 4.3, “Localizing Food Systems: Strengthening Sustainable Territorial Development”.

Over the last years, Geographical Indications (GIs) have emerged globally as a powerful Intellectual Property and rural development tool. A GI is a sign used to designate goods originating from a particular place that has a specific quality or reputation attributable to that geographical origin. These qualities are the result of local factors, natural and/or human, embedded in the GI specification describing the characteristics of the product, its method of production and the delimited geographical area. GIs represent a collective asset linked to local heritage and the product’s reputation. They can be effective tools for building territorial processes towards the achievement of sustainable development goals (SDGs).

In the framework of the Independent Dialogue, the presentation of GI cases and the exchange among experts from all over the world generated valuable insights and meaningful recommendations towards advancing equitable livelihoods through fair and inclusive value chains as well as sustainable food systems.

Discussion topics included:

- GIs to support market access, and fair and equitable value chains: empowering local producers;
- GIs for quality management, traceability and consumer protection;
- GIs to preserve local natural heritage, environment and biodiversity;
- GIs to promote cultural identity, and ensure food and dietary diversity.

ACTION TRACKS

<input type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 1: Ensure access to safe and nutritious food for all
<input type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 2: Shift to sustainable consumption patterns
<input type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 3: Boost nature-positive production
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 4: Advance equitable livelihoods
<input type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 5: Build resilience to vulnerabilities, shocks and stress

KEYWORDS

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

MAIN FINDINGS

The main finding of the independent dialogue was to confirm the crucial contribution of the GI scheme – with its territorial approach – to sustainable food systems and SDGs. The dialogue also acknowledged that GI schemes are key drivers to bring stakeholders together along an equitable value-chain, but do not automatically result in positive effects on sustainability.

In this respect, the important role of regulations and public authorities was acknowledged, notably to ensure the control, traceability and enforcement of the rules of production defined by the community of producers for the benefits of producers and consumers. The cooperation between countries to fight misuses and to protect the reputation of GIs was also deemed crucial.

Within this framework, GI products' specifications appear to be an important instrument for increasing the sustainability of production systems. Territorial governance of localized agri-food value-chains is an important outcome that benefits public-private coordination.

In particular, sound GI products' specifications play a critical role in the preservation and promotion of natural resources, including biodiversity, cultural identity and food diversity. This needs to be better communicated to consumers, for example, for products whose consumption contributes to promote traditional and diversified diets, and preserve noteworthy landscapes.

Participants supported the idea to scale-up the benefits of the GI territorial strategies by creating connections and cooperation between GI territories. In particular, cooperation between countries and initiatives, even at different stages of development, is appropriate to share experiences and best practices, create synergies and develop joint promotion on GI products. This network of initiatives would contribute to sustainable food systems at the global level, and could enhance linkages between urban centers and GI territories, so to better promote local and global consumption of GIs. In this context, the need for technical assistance has also been noted, while benefitting from synergies with projects and concepts on agro-ecology.

Participants recognized it was time to promote the GI business model that integrates all the dimensions of sustainability, i.e, not only economic but also social and environmental dimensions, including cultural heritage. Indeed, these dimensions are intrinsic to the GI concept.

These findings on GIs could actually bring lessons and experiences to other territorial approaches to contribute to sustainable food systems and SDGs .

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 - 1/4

Topic 1: GIs to support market access and fair and equitable value chains: empowering local producers.

Participants in the related discussion groups all agree on the relevance of GI initiatives to strengthen value chains and make them more equitable.

GI initiatives allow space for dialogue and recognize the roles of the most vulnerable actors (smallholders, women, youth) in defining and adding value to the specific characteristics of a given GI. They also facilitate dialogue and governance between different operators and increase trust (which is particularly necessary in long and export-driven value chains), which finally result in living and dynamic rural areas.

To this end, empowerment of local producers is crucial. The role of neutral facilitators, especially grassroots organizations, was emphasized to accompany producers in the long term, provide technical support for the product differentiation, support the development of alliances and a territorial governance, enhance the scalability of the project and equilibrate forces between the various operators in a given value chain, to the advantage of small economic actors.

Participants also highlighted the crucial role of public authorities and legal framework, as a starting point for the empowerment and joint efforts from different stakeholders. The control and traceability system was also acknowledged as an important instrument to strengthen value chains.

Participants' views on actions to be supported:

- In value chains where the added value is not sufficiently redistributed to primary producers, the definition of minimum prices could be considered.
- GI initiatives can feed trust among actors, but sometimes distrust can remain an important barrier to overcome; in this respect, innovative platforms, including social media, represent interesting tools to build trust between producers as well as with consumers.

ACTION TRACKS

<input type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 1: Ensure access to safe and nutritious food for all
<input type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 2: Shift to sustainable consumption patterns
<input type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 3: Boost nature-positive production
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 4: Advance equitable livelihoods
<input type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 5: Build resilience to vulnerabilities, shocks and stress

KEYWORDS

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

OUTCOMES FOR EACH DISCUSSION TOPIC - 2/4

Topic 2: GIs for quality management, traceability and consumer protection

Participants from different countries confirmed that control from farm to fork depends on national regulations. This results in a variety of systems and needs. On the other hand, common challenges also emerged, such as the importance of continued, effective and accessible controls and traceability.

More specifically, strengthening collective management organization is the key factor for quality management and to govern the internal control system in particular, in combination with some form of external control. Having said that, external control bodies, public or private, often lack in developing countries.

In terms of traceability, the participants suggested that solid systems for continued monitoring should be established and be accessible to small producers, without adding excessive costs. Traceability was underlined as a condition to access export markets. A system of farm/operator code, under the supervision of an internal or external control body, seems to be affordable for producers even in developing countries. But there are some difficulties for the recognition of the GI specifications and control/certification on the foreign markets, due to the diversity of national GI logos.

For example, IT based traceability systems (e. g. QR code) are solutions that could also be more accessible to consumers to ensure high consumer protection and trust. Contrary to organic or fair-trade labels, that are based on general and easily understandable principles, GI product specifications throughout the world, and even within the same country, considerably vary as to the level of requirements, linkage to traditions, landscapes or cultural values as well as the environmental impacts of the production. Therefore, it makes it much more difficult to establish a high standard and even more to communicate on promises to consumers.

The important role of the government was highlighted for increasing producers' awareness and compliance with the GI product's specification. Their role in increasing consumers' awareness was also noted, including with campaigns for public awareness and with the objective of making local people proud of their own GI product.

Participants also call for reducing, when it is the case, the governmental pressure on registration, which should occur after management and control system are fully established. In the meantime, temporary GI protection could be implemented to avoid misuses.

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 - 3/4

Topic 3: GIs to preserve local natural heritage, environment and biodiversity.

Some local communities have been successful in recognizing and adding value to their products, through the GI scheme, based on the interactions involved in the “human-nature” relationship, often embedded in complex ecosystems.

Participants agreed that GIs represent an opportunity for the preservation of biodiversity and the environment, while there is not an automatic correlation.

GI products’ specifications potentially allow a broad variety of options aimed at increasing ecosystem conservation. Some of these options are the inclusion of specific plant varieties and local animal breeds, the introduction of hedges, limits on crop yields and density as well as animal production, and the implementation of agroforestry production methods.

The preservation of natural heritage, biodiversity, and the ecosystem represent objectives which are envisaged at various degrees and forms. Based on the several cases discussed, no generalization is possible.

Participants also raised the risks linked to the intensification of production, when the GI becomes a victim of its own success and producers do not organize themselves to limit the potential negative impact on the use of resources.

Key factors have been highlighted to increase GI contribution to the preservation of the natural heritage: producer awareness on the importance of their natural resources, collective agreement on the modalities to implement and regular self-assessment of the GI impacts on the territory, in particular in the environmental dimension. In this view, raising awareness and building the capacities of producers is crucial.

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 - 4/4

Topic 4: GIs to promote cultural identity, and ensure food and dietary diversity.

Participants confirmed through their experience that many GIs contribute a lot to cultural identity and food culture, by keeping them alive, preserving their reputation and their link to the territory.

GIs are recognized as an effective mechanism for the transmission of know-how and cultural identities to younger generations. Likewise, through the preservation of specific quality food, GIs can promote food and dietary diversity. This is particularly the case for GIs linked to gastronomy and traditional diets.

Several examples of GIs contributing to healthy diets were also mentioned. For example, many fermented products are protected by GIs while they represent markers of the diversity of the food heritage and dietary diversity. Other traditional processing methods were also mentioned for their nutritional interest, such as drying, which makes fruits and vegetables available when not in season.

The cases of products from local biodiversity were also highlighted. On the link between GI and nutrition and health, participants recommended more data collection and research to be carried out.

Participants also underlined the important question of the origin of raw materials: when they are not locally produced, the link to the cultural identity and biodiversity is weak.

To increase the contribution of GI to sustainable food systems, participants emphasized the importance of supporting a more comprehensive approach, including social and environmental pillars, with emphasis to their link to cultural heritage. This vision should also be better communicated to consumers, citizens and tourists, through education activities, while reflected in the GI products' specifications.

The role of primary producers should also be more emphasized in general and fruitful synergies could be enhanced, including with agro-ecology, Globally Important Agricultural Heritage sites (GIAHS), cooks and gastronomy networks.

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

From the nine discussion groups, some issues emerged in relation with constraints, specific practices to be recommended for increased sustainability, the need to explore more in detail certain areas, and priorities to be given to specific topics of interest, as described below.

a) Strengths and constraints within food systems

The contribution to sustainability depends on several factors, such as the kind of product, initiative drivers and legal framework.

The economic interests and the profitability of the production are still among the main priorities of most producers. This could induce excess of specialization and standardization of the GI product and increase the risk of the degradation of the natural resources involved in the production process, compromising the overall capacity of the GI to ensure the preservation and protection of local natural and cultural heritage, biodiversity, and ecosystems and to convey to consumers the information on its territorialized positive impact.

However, the preservation of natural and cultural assets is strictly linked to the survival of the GI in the long term and therefore to the economic benefits derived from its use. Raising producers' awareness on this issue could be an effective strategy to encourage stakeholders' commitment to additional (and/or stricter) rules and to enhance the implementation of best practices for resource management.

Some contradictions between GI processes and regulations were also noted:

- Sometimes the local "know-how" does not comply with international trade rules (for example sanitary and phytosanitary norms). This makes the process more complex, and legislation should consider some flexibility for traditional and GI products.
- Strong and efficient value chain coordination might result in the control of, and agreement on, volumes, which have an impact on prices. This can be considered in certain countries a breach of competition laws. Studies could be developed to demonstrate the advantages of such practices over the risks.
- Top-down approaches may lead to unused and non-effective GIs; studies on how to grant temporary protection and register the GI only once the whole management system is in place would be interesting.

b) Areas that need further exploration

More studies on the sustainability of GIs to cover various contexts and products would be interesting to disseminate, especially with regard to the environmental dimension. In particular, research on the impact of practices or the use of species on biodiversity must be intensified including in countries in which GIs are not notorious. Regarding the social component, participants mentioned the importance to collect more data and develop research on the link with food and diet diversity as a promising area.

Likewise, the need for producers to have more elements on economic impacts was recognized as an important aspect to support their engagement. Participants also highlighted the importance of qualitative empirical studies of specific GIs to provide lessons learned and best practices at local level and on the efficiency of underlying management and regulatory systems.

At global level, participants highlighted the need for more homogenization of the criteria of validity for the registration of GIs among the different countries.

A specific topic for research was also identified in relation with the creation and testing of traceability solutions together with producers and consumers in different situations/regions.

c) Practices that are needed for food system sustainability

The importance of biodiversity and ecosystem preservation is still not sufficiently addressed in public policies concerning GIs. Inclusion of agro-ecological practices or sustainable production practices in GI products' specifications should be systematically suggested.

The crucial role of collective action from local actors of GI value chains was discussed as a way to ensure successful bottom-up approaches, including in countries where the State has a strong role.

In this specific context, the role of NGOs could be key to stimulate the discussion and find compromises, especially in the product specification design. Moreover, consistent actions to promote consumers' awareness are still lacking.

d) Stakeholders whose interests should be prioritized

All groups converged in recognizing the central roles of producers in managing GIs, and the importance to empower the more vulnerable ones, including smallholders and women, and their associations. Producers should take the lead in developing the products' specifications as well as managing the quality and controls, and develop knowledge and capacities on preserving sustainability in all its dimensions.

In this context, for smallholders, it was suggested to improve credit systems (better access, favorable conditions) to contribute to reaching a more balanced power between companies and small producers/ cooperatives regarding investments and avoid tensions between the governance of the value chain and territorial governance. It is also important to build awareness among national authorities on the importance of accompanying producer communities in the sustainability pathway, by showing them the interest in preserving local resources, explaining the link between the GI impact on ecosystem preservation, the food and diet diversity and the interest in economic benefits. National authorities should also be supported for creating awareness on GIs among producers and consumers and enforcing GI regulations .

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