



# Race to Zero - Climate & the Future of Food

Tuesday, 17 November 2020 11:00 - 12:30 GMT

## SUMMARY KEYWORDS

food, systems, indigenous peoples, action, climate, solutions, question, based, process, global, incentives, land, civil society, summit, smallholder farmers, perspective, great, governments

Ruth Richardson

Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. I'm [Ruth Richardson](#), Executive Director of the Global Alliance for the future of food, and welcome to Climate and the Future Food Priority Actions for Systems Transformation. We are thrilled to be part of the Race to Zero Dialogues Regenerative Resilience Food Systems Day. The [Global Alliance](#) is a strategic alliance of philanthropic foundations, working together and with others to transform food systems. Our work is guided by seven indivisible principles: renewability, resilience, diversity, equity, helpfulness, inclusion and interconnectedness. We like to say these are a set, not a menu. You can't pick and choose the ones you like or that are easiest. We as a global community need to advance these principles in our actions in a profound way that holds them all up in equal measure. Our mission is to leverage our resources and networks to support this needed transformation. We believe that our unique contribution is to help forge new insights, convene system actors and where possible to stimulate action towards transformative change.

We are thrilled to co-host this event with [Salzburg Global Seminar](#), with whom we hosted a series of events earlier this year. Both our organizations strive to connect system actors that don't normally work together, creating a confluence of perspectives that can give way to real and lasting change. Our recent experience of holding events where the food and climate communities could connect showed us how dialogue can be used to facilitate much needed inquiry to elevate convergences and divergences, and to build potential interest in collaborative action. It also inspired this very session. The reality of food systems transformation is that it's complex and very challenging, and it's absolutely fundamental to dealing with the crises we face from climate change to hunger to global pandemics. Just two weeks ago, a study from the Oxford Martin School showed that even if all fossil fuel emissions stopped tomorrow the food systems greenhouse gas emissions would still make the planet uninhabitable. Similarly, the findings of a recent pandemic report confirms that "the same human activities that drive climate change and biodiversity loss also drive pandemic risk through their impacts on our environment".

So food systems play a role in many of the great challenges we face, but they also provide brilliant pathways to solutions around the world. Many thousands of initiatives are already challenging the status quo, telling new stories about the future of food and driving transformative systems change. They also

show us that action on food systems is action on climate. Speaking just to the work of philanthropies and funders, just a small subset of the larger ecosystem actors around the world, there are many initiatives that give me hope, especially as they gain momentum. There's the [Agroecology Fund](#), which is focused on shifting the dominant narrative about food and hunger and offers pooled grant making to support agro ecological solutions. There's [FORA](#), the Funders for Regenerative Agriculture, a network in North America working to accelerate the emergence of regenerative agriculture, healthy soil and working lands that support people and the planet. And there's the transformational investing in food systems initiative, also known as TIFS, which seeks to catalyze investment in principle based agro ecologically aligned food businesses that are economically viable and deliver sustainable impact. These are just a few but they immediately show us what's possible and how we effectively invest in and support solutions for a better future of food.

So as we look ahead to [COP 26](#) and to the [United Nations Food Systems Summit](#), and to the milestones and equally important global processes like the 47th Committee on World Food Security and [COP 15](#). We have real opportunities to advance the case for systemic solutions to shift the narrative on food systems and send a resounding signal to the world's governments to act for healthy recovery, thereby changing the course of human, animal, and ecological health and well-being. We know this is possible. It's what we humans do well, we change the course of history for better or for worse. This is our imperative today. We must change the course of history for the better, and bend the arc of these events in a positive direction.

So today we will hear from five inspiring speakers. We will then have a few responses from representatives from COP 26, and the United Nations Food Systems summit. And we hope that together with your participation this dialogue can create space for engagement, for sharing ideas, and where possible to build critical mass around common calls to action, as we head into 2021. We're excited to have all of you with us here today. Just some small bits of housekeeping before we move into the rest of our agenda. If you haven't already done so you're invited to introduce yourself to the attendees in the chat box and to make comments also in the chat box. Please put questions you have in the Q&A box just to help us track those adequately. I would like to now pass the floor to a wonderful colleague, with whom we have been working in the most thoughtful supportive and collaborative partnership. [Clare Shine](#) who is the Vice President and Chief Program Officer of Salzburg Global Seminar. Clare, over to you.

[Clare Shine](#)

Thank you so much Ruth. Hello everybody, it's a real pleasure to be joined through the ether today for such an important conversation. And thank you to the Race to Zero dialogue organizers, it's such an important step for us all to come together. We're delighted that Salzburg Global Seminar has partnered this year with the Global Alliance for the Future of Food, and by way of Salzburg Global, a completely independent nonprofit that was founded out of the conflict at the end of the Second World War by three young people. We challenge current and future leaders to shape a more creative just and sustainable world and in our nearly 75 years around 38,000 fellows from about 175 countries have come together through our work. The Sustainable Development Goals and climate action underpin everything we do. And we look across the divides, for example, focusing at the moment on ending pandemics and thinking of new paradigms to link human, animal and ecological health. Ruth talked about systems transformation. We believe that means starting with systems with people in organizations where they are and building

trust rather than stigmatizing. It isn't easy. It requires each of us to think about going beyond our training or experience, our mandates, our award systems. It requires listening, imagination and courage, but as we said, we can do it.

The conversation today will include five stellar speakers who bridge very different life parts sectors and scales. We'll put a PDF with their bios into the chat box so you'll be able to find out more about them and the work that they do as you go through. We're going to kick off with a 30 minute debate with the five speakers followed by about 20 minutes of questions and answers with all of you. As you know, we asked everybody who registered to share answers to two questions. I'm going to ask Jenn now to put up the word cloud for the first question which was "what are your hopes and expectations for the UN food system summit and COP 26 either going into them, or what you hope will come out of them?" So for our first round of questions I'm going to ask our speakers to keep their answers very brief. I'll call first from the climate perspective on [Teresa Anderson](#), who is the Climate Policy Coordinator for [ActionAid International](#), and she's focusing in the UN climate negotiations on protecting the rights of land and livelihoods of vulnerable family farming communities, to reason a quick answer to that first question please.

[Teresa Anderson](#)

Thank you so much, Clare and thank you so much to the organizers for this great and really timely event. Really a great opportunity to bring these perspectives together so thank you. So on the great question on "what our hopes and expectations are for the food summit and the COP 26?" I think it's important to register that smallholder farmers are the ones who really do feed the world and these are the ones that have been systematically exploited and marginalized by busy agrobusiness whose model has actually failed to feed the world, in spite of all the land, in spite of all the subsidies that big scale large scale agriculture has been given over the decades. They have still failed to feed the world, and in fact industrial agriculture agribusiness has been harming ecosystems and the climate and driving aggressive concentration of land and wealth and contributing to the pandemics that we find ourselves in now.

So the [IPCC](#) special report on land, which came out last year, made it really clear that to address both climate change and food security we really do need to shift to agro ecological models of farming that support smallholder farmers (especially women smallholder farmers who hold up half the sky) and the COP 26 negotiations on agriculture really need to take forward the findings of the IPCC Special Report on Land and put in place guidelines or a framework that really helps to encourage a shift from global industrial agriculture to agroecological methods and less than better meat. This shift needs to be really guided by just transition principles that do a number of things that help to address and not exacerbate inequalities. We need to transform our food systems to work for people, nature and the climate. We need to make sure that the processes to shape Transition Plans are genuinely inclusive and participatory, and we need to make sure that the planning and policy frameworks that enable this shift are really comprehensive to support communities themselves to make those shifts as needed. So that's what I would love to see the future big global discussions leading towards.

[Clare Shine](#)

And now I'll bring in the perspective on Conservation in the Low Carbon Economy: [André](#) is the Executive Director of the [Amazon Environmental Research Institute](#), and the CO facilitator of the [Brazilian Coalition on Climate, Forests and Agriculture](#). André, a quick first round on your hopes.

André Guimarães

Thank you, Clare and thank you very much for the organizers for inviting me here today. This is an extremely important conversation we have in here today. Well, my take on this is very simple: I think we are in front of a paradigm shift, and the expectation that we have looking from Brazil, from the Amazon, to the problem of the balance between fighting deforestation and producing more food, from our standpoint is a fake battle. We actually have to find a way to balance those. We need to produce more food at the same time that we protect more the environment, and at the same time that we protect human rights. So these, all these things they have to happen together. The way that we have been developing ourselves in our economies up until now is not going to be the way that we developed our economies. From now on, we are facing a number of new pressures from consumers, from voters, from societies in general and from the geopolitics in the world. And we have to reshape the way that we relate ourselves with nature.

And very quickly let me give them the Brazilian example, which I think it's an interesting one to share with, with the audience here. I mean 40-50 years ago Brazil was a net importer of food. Today 40-50 years later, Brazil is number one, two or three in the key most traded commodities in the world. Brazil is one of the 23 countries that do produce food for its population and a surplus to export. And this is a very successful story indeed and I'm very proud of it, but there was a price tag associated to this process: we lost half of the central savannas biome that we have in Brazil that's a habit we have, we lost roughly 20% of the Amazon, many traditional communities have lost their lands, many indigenous communities have lost their lives and their cultural structures. So there was a cost associated to this process, it can't continue the way it is from now on.

So that's what we make clear at the Brazilian Coalition on Climate, Forests and Agriculture. We basically grouped together different perspectives from the private sector, from the financial sector, from the civil society, from academia, from the government and its different agencies and we try to come up with convergence. We try to come up with solutions that would allow us to go the next level which means produce more in the same area and conserve more and protect more civil and human rights. That's what the coalition is aiming at and that's what we believe needs to be done from now on in the food industry.

Clare Shine

Thank you so much, André, that's a great moment for me to bring in the perspective of indigenous peoples with [Andrea Carmen](#). She has been the Executive Director for nearly 30 years of the [International Indian Treaty Council](#), which represents indigenous people from North Central and South America, as well as the Caribbean and Pacific. So Andrea, I know you have some photographs to accompany your introductory words.

Andrea Carmen

Thank you so much and respectful greetings to all of you. Regarding our hopes and expectations for the Global Food Summit, indigenous peoples have been coming together now for more than 20 years to talk about food sovereignty and maintained, as the slide shows, that food sovereignty is a prerequisite for food security. Our definition of food sovereignty is affirming a rights based and a culturally based approach based on indigenous peoples rights as was referred to. We can't be sacrificed for any greater cause, because of our ability to protect the world's biodiversity. The United Nations maintains that 80% of the remaining global biodiversity is on indigenous peoples lands. And we have also time tested methods: our original seeds, our ways of knowing, our relationships based on our cultures and traditional practices are essential for adaptation to climate change, as well as for sustaining our ability to feed ourselves in our communities. And it's recognized by indigenous peoples as well as the United Nations that climate change poses the single greatest threat to food security in the future for all peoples. The [United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change](#) has finally after many years of activism and resistance by indigenous peoples recognize the importance of indigenous peoples' traditional knowledge, including our knowledge and food systems to adaptation and mitigation of climate change, through the creation of the [Local Communities and Indigenous Peoples Platform](#), which I'm honored to be the chair of this year, and that is based on equal participation and equal voice of state representatives and indigenous peoples representatives. And based on our right to free prior informed consent, which is affirmed in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous peoples. All of these elements need to be central for our participation to be meaningful and effective in the food summit, and our contributions to be respected. Thank you.

Clare Shine

Okay, thank you, Andrea. And that takes me swiftly to [Saswati Bora](#), who represents the perspective of Food Systems Innovation, leading on that agenda for the [World Economic Forum](#), and also leading their food and agricultural work in India.

Saswati Bora

Thank you, Clare and thank you to the organizers for inviting me to this very important discussion. My hope for both the UN Food Systems Summit and a COP 26 will be that both these major milestones will work towards adopting a more holistic and integrated systems approach that examines both the food and climate systems as a whole, rather than in separate parts. Because we know that to nutritiously and sustainably feed almost 10 billion people by 2050. Food systems will probably need to meet four key objectives. It will need to be sustainable, to minimize the negative environmental impacts, conserve biodiversity and natural resources, and strengthen resiliency against future shocks like the COVID-19 pandemic. It will also need to be nutritious and healthy it needs to provide at promote consumption of healthy food for a healthy diet, it will need to be efficient to minimize food loss and waste, and as Teresa mentioned it needs to be inclusive, it has to bring in the perspectives and bring economic and social inclusion for smaller farmers, indigenous people, women and youth.

So my hope is that the UN Food Summit will bring an understanding on what we mean by an integrated food systems vision, and what are the approaches, focusing on some of the key pathways that through cultic collective multi stakeholder action could lead us to some positive tangible change for both the people and planet. For the COP 26, I hope it also recognizes the larger role of food systems to meet our climate objectives beyond just looking at production and land use as to really encompass food loss and

waste, and also sustainable consumption. And so that would probably mean that both UN Food Systems Summit and the COP 26 need to examine the synergies and possible tradeoffs between climate objectives, health objectives, socio economic and livelihood objectives and find pathways to collective action and collaboration. Thank you.

Clare Shine

Great, thank you Saswati. Our fifth speaker [Million Belay](#) has just joined. Million really brings in the perspective of food sovereignty, so great timing. He's the coordinator of the [Alliance for Food Sovereignty in Africa](#), which brings together diverse civil society organizations, spanning small scale farmers and pastoralists to consumer movements and indigenous peoples. Million, some brief words for your first contribution, please.

Million Belay

Okay, in terms of COP 26, we found as a civil society group that the whole process is challenging. Our hope would be to just go back and rewire the whole process, but we know this is not possible. I was just participating in some of the events like the country level negotiation and you know how it's going to run, I could feel that it would be a really rushed process. I was not sure how many people, real people, who are producing and processing food, and have waves of interaction within the food system would be participating and I could feel that this is still a northern hemisphere agenda. That's where I feel now, I don't have a message only concern probably but I will speak about this much more when they come later.

Clare Shine

Well, Million brought us very neatly brought us to the second question that the audience as well as our speakers were asked: "which was in areas of divergence or tension, what are the opportunities for convergence and protect potential collective action?". Jenn, perhaps you could bring up that wordcloud of some of the feedback that we had from participants on what they saw as both divergence and convergence and Million just touched on something very important. Are we talking past, or are we talking tomorrow? Because that is a key part of moving from divergence to convergence. So now I'd like to get another round of inputs and perhaps play with the order, bringing in first, André, with the perspective from Amazonia on conservation and the low carbon economy, André some brief comments from you about how we get to workable points of convergence in these two processes.

André Guimarães

Thank you, Clare for that and for the question. Let me answer that with an example, something that has happened with us here about five, six years ago. The year was 2014, we were one year away from the COP in Paris which took place in December 2015. So one year before that. The civil society in Brazil was very concerned about the quality of the INDC that the federal government would be presenting in Paris. The civil society was concerned that it that would be a weak INDC. At the same time, the private sector, particularly the agrobusiness sector was also very concerned that Brazil would present a very rigorous INDC and they would have to pay the bill at the end of the day. So there was a concern from civil society that was different from the concern from the private sector. But at some point in time in late 2014 they sat down around the table and decided to work together, because they thought, "Well, this is something that interests both sides, and we need to come to convergence otherwise the government will present



something that's going to be bad for both sides so we need to sit down, negotiate, find a way, engage with the government and move on with the agenda". So I think that that's an example of how important it is to make sure that you understand what it is that the other side wants, and at the end of the day, we were able not just to come up with an agreement between these two sides of the equation, but also to create the Brazilian Coalition on Climate Force and Agriculture, which is now celebrating this fifth year of existence and has been working with different state level governments, private sector, financial sector and so on. And just to finalize, the main objective of the coalition is to stop illegal deforestation and produce more food in the Brazilian crop lands and pasture lands. It's simple to observe but very complex to implement, we need to have these dialogue spaces in which we will build consensus and converge to objectives that are common to the different sides.

Clare Shine

Excellent. Thank you. Let me bring in Teresa now from the climate perspective.

Teresa Anderson

Thank you so much. It's another good question, it is very important that those of us that are working on the issues of food, land, indigenous rights and farmers have this conversation about net zero targets on our radar as it poses potential immense threats if not done right. And I feel that this is a good space to talk about this now because we do need to find the right kind of action to move forward. We do need to collectively scrutinize this flurry of net zero targets that are coming out by governments and corporations right now before we accept them at face value. We really need to start looking out for the net part of the net zero targets, because almost all net zero targets are relying far too heavily on offsetting our negative emissions technologies and with far too much distance to the 2050 goals. But these huge net components really disguise a lack of transformative action to address greenhouse gases, and all of these offsetting dependencies really add up to a huge and unrealistic expectation for carbon offsetting and reliance on negative emission technologies such as bioenergy with carbon capture and storage, which will either not work, or if it does, will drive a massive land grabs. There is simply not enough land on the planet to meet all of the corporate and government offsetting targets combined within these net zero goals.

So, more is definitely not better when it comes to all this net netting out. We're going to see the vulnerable communities who've done the least to cause the climate problem, who already face the worst impacts, being pushed off the land. Just as with the previous biofuel land grab that we've seen over the last decade, but potentially orders of magnitude bigger, which should raise real flags for many of us. So if we're going to have a chance of meeting the goals, we really need to push for climate targets that require real transformation of our food and energy, our transport construction and economic systems that bring actual emissions down, and that have ambitious milestone targets for 2025 and 2030, with no offsets or reliance on dangerous negative emissions technologies. So we all need to be getting behind the goal, call for action for real zero, greenhouse gases and better scrutinizing the net zero targets, before celebrating. And this means that those of us that work in the food sector have to reach out to push for ambition in other sectors too and that's where there's real potential for collaboration for greater ambition.

Clare Shine

Great. Thanks Teresa that's a great moment to bring in Saswati there, who works at the level of food systems innovation. You heard the questioning of the way targets are set and the risk of land grabs, how does that look from the perspective of the World Economic Forum Society?

Saswati Bora

I think what we are realizing more and more right now is that we require a fundamental change in the way our food is produced, including the practices of more than 500 million smallholder farmers around the world, and the way food is consumed, which is the consumption patterns of now more than 7 billion individuals worldwide. And that requires several transitions to more sustainable supply chains, to greater production efficiency, to more biodiversity resilience, to healthier diets and inclusive livelihoods. But I think the question right now is who pays for these transitions, what are the incentives that can overcome the hurdles that are preventing stakeholders from making this change. So we really need to focus on incentives that can address these transition costs, the cost of behavior change that can fill knowledge and awareness gaps and really be powerful enough to change the mindsets of billions of individuals.

So I think one of the biggest opportunities and perhaps also one of the most challenging aspects is to realign incentives to build climate and food systems which are fit for the future. Many of the current incentive mechanisms, whether it's subsidies or business models that are in place, were put in place decades back when some of the imperatives for countries were food security and self-sufficiency. But now that we know that the world has moved towards a more holistic and integrated understanding of food systems, and we know that it has to meet aspirations for both healthy people and a sustainable planet, we really need to read look at our repurposing existing incentives and create new ones where needed.

Earlier this year, we launched a report which looked at incentives for food systems transformation, we highlighted the role of public investments and public policies which we believe could be one of the biggest drivers of rapid and widespread change, we look at the role of shifting consumer demand, the role of businesses and institutional investors. But our main point is that all of these pathways are interconnected and we need progress against all of them to support the goal of realigning incentives. And we also need to understand that there will be tradeoffs between many of these interconnected outcomes within food systems, for example, for high cost of producing environmental socially responsible goods may make it more expensive for consumers. So, how do governments come in and provide the adequate safety nets to protect vulnerable consumers. At the same time, it might lead to loss of income for some producers if we have to move them to more sustainable practices. So how do we ably compensate them to make that transition? I think, from my perspective, the role of multi-stakeholder collective action, whether it's countries civil society organization, private sector donors, or farmer organizations, will be required at both a declared global and regional level but also at the country level to really induce this change.

Clare Shine

Great, thank you so much Saswati. I want to bring in Million from the perspective of food sovereignty, where do you see the opportunities convergence? Particularly because you highlighted what you see as the imbalance, with the global north under the current status quo.

Million Belay



I think this would have been a fantastic opportunity, honestly, because the African Union has the power of bringing everybody on the table, and there is a lot of support for this as we see. So, if we could bring those who are concerned about the crisis in the food system that we are facing around the table and have a serious discussion about the power imbalance that we're seeing... Because in the food system as it is now they're very powerful interests. Surely if we could give a chance to those who are producing and processing foods, and those webs of relationships, if we could bring them together and analyze the policy incoherence that exists in almost every country even at the higher level, that would be fantastic. I'm just coming from another African Union event and there is a recognition there that even policies that are related to food are very much incoherent. So if these kinds of spaces could give us an opportunity to talk about those policy incoherencies, if they could have encouraged a democratic participation of the people, it would have been a fantastic opportunity.

Clare Shine

Brilliant. That's a good moment for me to bring in Andrea, who represents indigenous peoples. And Andrea just a brief answer please, so that we can move on towards the questions and answers.

Andrea Carmen

Thank you. There are several concerns that have been raised here by previous speakers. Things like carbon offsets and market based solutions that we're very concerned about are taking too prominent a role in the planning for the global food summit. The relationship, with all due respect, with World Economic Forum seems to put the focus on large scale food production. There is a recent expression of partnership between the multi-national conglomerate of pesticide corporations Croplife and FAO, which is very concerning. You can see this is on my own Yaqui community: a lot of these pesticides have been banned for use by the exporting country but are still sent, and sprayed on our children and our families with resulting deaths, birth defects, and cancers. And these elements coming into the discussion about the global food systems is very concerning for indigenous peoples vis-à-vis, with the summit coming up, and the promotion of market based solutions of large scale production. We've heard about tradeoffs, but indigenous peoples rights and lands can't be what's traded off for global and corporate solutions, which are not really solutions at all. They're perpetuating the very violations of our rights as well as the global climate and food crisis. Thank you.

Clara Shine

Thank you. So, I want to close the end of this section by asking for a one word call to action or a short call to action to the organizers. But first I'd like to dive straight into some questions coming from the group. The first, trying to read out of the corner of my eye, is to Saswati, thinking about that issue about negative externalities and the true cost of how we actually price foods and food production and the negative environmental externalities. It's not of course a question only for Saswati, but I'd like to start with you and then broaden it to the whole group if I may.

Saswati Bora

What exactly is the question on the negative externalities?

Clare Shine

I'm trying to bring it back up in the chat box, please excuse me trying to read out to the caller bio. There we are. What is the view on how to internalize negative externalities in food pricing, rather than accepting that food which is better for people and planet and farm animals has to be more expensive. I think this perhaps should be taken in the context also of some of the comments that Million and others raised about what is perceived as the big power imbalance between small versus huge industrial food producers. Is that enough for you to get your teeth into an answer?

Saswati Bora

Yeah, I think there have been a huge discussions recently among the global community to really look at what is the true cost of food, and really trying to factor in some of the negative externalities, and to really look at supporting governments to figure out what is the true cost of food and at what are the key aspects of evidence that would be needed to make those policy decisions, which will help them to provide better sustainable support or nutrition outcomes in their policy decisions. There's a lack of evidence for what kind of interventions would be good in a certain country or regional context and I think that would require building the capacity of countries and governments, so that they can be propped up to formulate policies which can really take into account the true cost of food. This means that they would probably need to really be provided with the talent tools and technical skills including data and methodologies that will help them to make those informed decisions. I know there is a lot of work on creating the framework that can help governments and to make those decisions but then again, each country will have to choose their own bespoke model which meets their own national priorities and make those decisions based on debt policy priorities. So what would be really helpful is if the UN Food System Summit, or others could create sort of a capacity where our support for countries can integrate the true cost of food in their kind of policy decisions.

Clare Shine

Thank you. Let me bring André here because you spoke earlier about how civil society and private sector interests had found a way of collaborating more productively. I'd like to hear you. Give your reflections on that question but in the specific context of coalition building for change, which involves, as I understood it, changing the power dynamics in the space as well.

André Guimaraes

I'd like to build on society's comment. When it comes to incorporating the externalities into the financial equations, there are huge incentives for the business to expand. Let me put it in very simple words, I do subsidize chainsaws with my taxpayer money to chop down trees in the Amazon today in 2020, in November of 2020, that's what's happening in my country. So, we have to stop that. I mean, we do have to convert or to somehow re-channel those subsidies and incentives to make sure that the forests are standing. The problem that we have in the Amazon for example, and that goes for the tropical forest in general, is that standing forests do not have a value for the economy in general. We need to reach out to all the resources, re-channel the incentive so that the forests are kept standing at the same time that you produce more and that you have more access to technology and more access to credit lines and technical assistance to perform your activity that goes straight to the smallholders system of production in India. For example, there are 7000 smallholders in the Amazon. They occupy an area the size of about 55-60 million hectares and half of that land is already deforested. And for one reason: these farms have no access to capital, they have no access to technology, they have no access to infrastructure, the only

capital they have is the natural capital and that's what they use to live. So, the equation is totally upside down, we do need to provide the means through incentive and through technical assistance. Incentives need to be rethought and need to be reached out so that we promote intensification instead of as densification of our agricultural systems. Once again as I said at the beginning, the way that we brought ourselves up to this point is not going to be the way that we will continue to grow our economies to grow our food production systems in the future, we have to redesign. The incentives and subsidies are a fundamental piece in this processes and incorporating the externalities into the decision making processes, particularly the social environmental externalities, seems to be obvious.

Clare Shine

Thank you, André. So running through this whole debate is a really loud focus on the need for holistic multi layered approaches, and although we've only heard one or two references to it, clearly the intersect of planetary and human health is absolutely fundamental. I'd like to bring Teresa in at this point because we've also heard that concepts and ideas that seem to be the brave new world are now being roundly critiqued in some areas, such as Nature-based Solutions, the words around net zero, etc. Why are so many groups to raise a concern around Nature-based Solutions and carbon offsetting?

Teresa Anderson

Well, the Nature-based Solutions discussion has been very interesting. It emerged just over a year ago as a potential new exciting way to bring together the discussions about ecosystems, the discussions about climate and potentially agriculture together. We were quite excited initially about the potential for this to create a space to really energize conversations about agroecology and recognizing the indigenous peoples and indigenous rights as one of the most effective ways to safeguard the world's critical biodiverse ecosystems. There could in theory have been a lot of great discussion, under the banner of Nature-based solutions.

Unfortunately, big actors like Shell Oil and BP and others have aggressively tried to really capture that conversation. And that's not really how many of us would have chosen to use that framing, but because nature has now become a solution to somebody else's problem. We have a lot of pressure on how ecosystems can play that role, how they have to play that role to fix the climate and that's not what we need to do, we need to be pushing shelter. We want to see fossil fuels out of the picture, we don't want to be legitimising fossil fuels through the use of ecosystems. That's why Nature-based solutions and offsetting is becoming a real problem.

Clare Shine

Great, thank you very much. And that's triggered more questions in the chat box here. I'm just extracting from this question because I want to put this out to Million and to Andrea. Today's broken food systems are a major driver accelerating humanitarian needs, including acute food insecurity in war torn societies. Can we work towards joining the big dots for the various stakeholders not part of the dialogue? So, first Million with your Africa insights and then we'll wrap up with Andrea from the indigenous nations perspective. Please, Million.

Million Belay

I'm not understanding the question very well to be honest.

Clara Shine

This is making the link between broken food systems and drivers of conflict. I think everybody on this call will know that climate itself is a threat multiplier, the climate-conflict link is very strong. Our questioner is also talking about acute food insecurity in war torn societies and the humanitarian Nexus. Does that help you?

Million Belay

Yeah. I think that's an area which needs us to really look into what causes those conflicts. There are so many reasons: taking people's spaces, food proceedings and food producing spaces for other purposes, can also elicit conflict. You know that conflict in Nigeria and Niger Delta. We know why that has happened. We know that there are places where large scale agriculture is being implemented and people are moved out of their land, and because of that, there's conflict. And conflict has so many entries and it's very difficult to connect every kind of conflict with the food system, but many of them are caused by the mismanagement of the kind of food system that's happening at the local community level. That's what I see, but once conflict occurs, obviously it's very difficult to go to the farm and markets, and it is built on displacements for people. It increases pressure on natural areas and when people are displaced and go to natural areas, the food system is all upside down. And by the way, due to conflict, people get used to the food that comes through aid even after the conflict is over. Thank you very much.

Clare Shine

Thank you, and now Andrea. Looking at humanitarian needs, and the importance of engaging stakeholders who are not sufficiently part of this dialogue.

Andrea Carmen

Thank you. I would like to comment on some of the terminologies that we tend to use. Often it is maintained that indigenous peoples are actually rights holders rather than stakeholders, and that too often we talk about destroying forests. But we forget that indigenous peoples live in this forest since time immemorial, and they are also being destroyed. I want to comment and add on the nature-based solutions, because indigenous peoples were always puzzled by that terminology and it speaks to, as you said, the holistic approach. An actual change, a transformative change in the way that we interact with the natural world, because all solutions are nature-based, and we are part of nature and the fact, as Teresa commented, that people are looking at nature as an "other" to be able to provide solutions removes us from the realization that we are part of nature, unless we realize that we are going to be increasingly threatened as a species as a human species. I think the pandemic is also showing us that disconnect; without realizing what we are doing to the natural world and what we have done to put us in a very vulnerable situation. We have seen the concept of nature-based solutions be utilized to support this idea of carbon offsets. For us, offsets of those kinds of concepts, which are not solutions at all, in fact directly threaten the survival of indigenous peoples on the planet as a whole.

So, with holistic solutions, I think we have to come together as a human family, but also realize that we are fundamentally part of nature. We are part of the natural world and we need to be part of the solution

as well, by taking all the rights holders, as well as stakeholders to the table where solutions are being discussed.

Clare Shine

Thank you so much. There is a very rich debate, getting underway in the chat box. Everyone is always shy at the beginning, so please feel free to be giving answers, web links and resources in that chat box. I can't get to all of it very sadly, what I want to do is to close this part of the agenda with a one brief call to action from each of our five speakers to the organizers of the UN Food Systems Summit and COP26. We just heard about this idea of one human family, in one sense that was the ideal at the founding of the UN and of all the different multilateral processes, it can sometimes feel hard to grasp now. But this pandemic with the associated threat multiplier is a chance for us to really think and get real again about that interdependence, including across borders. I'm going to start with Million, and then pass to Saswati, and then to the rest of our speakers, your one brief call to action to the organizers.

Million Belay

It's a very hard question. I think to slow it down a little bit, is to involve people in civil society in the right way. There's only thing that we can say.

Clare Shine

Saswati.

Saswati Bora

I think my call to action would be to encourage a holistic assistance approach for both of the organizers of the Food Systems Summit and COP26. And really look at realigning incentives to inclusive collective action, and really to recognize the dynamism of food systems. We know that farmers can provide elegant solutions to the challenge of transformation, they can make agriculture more renewable beneficently sustainable. By finding pathways for consumers to reward farmers for producing more nutritious and sustainable food. I think we could be really looking at realigning the incentives and also really looking at recognizing the dynamism of food systems.

Clare Shine

Excellent. Thank you. Andrea.

Andrea Carmen

Thank you. I think it's important that the organizers step back and challenge some of the assumptions about reliance on industrial and economic-based food systems, because that's not what feeds the world, as many have pointed out here, and also bring diverse food producers to the table from the beginning, from the planning stages, not just plug us in as speakers when the event happens. We have something to contribute we want to share as indigenous peoples, but it needs to be done in a respectful rights-based framework. Thank you.

Clare Shine

Thank you, Andrea, André.

André Guimarães

First of all, let me second Andrea, who is absolutely right. But in addition to that, my suggestion would be to own one-hand factoring. The so-called environmental and social externalities into the cost equation of food production, on one hand, and on the other hand, make sure that those additional resources are fairly distributed to make sure that the environment is protected and human rights are indeed also respected.

Clare Shine

Okay, and Teresa.

Teresa Anderson

I think my comments to the Food Systems Summit could also apply more largely, and to really ensure the need to be a rights-based process, because when you don't center it around the right to food, and you center the corporations in the mix the vision gets very lost. But in addition, one of the criticisms that's apparent around the Food Systems Summit is that it's trying to pick and choose which civil society organizations get to speak on behalf of the world instead of really working with the framework of the [Committee on World Food Security](#) (CFS) and civil society mechanism, in which farmers movements and NGOs have themselves decided who's going to represent them and what their messages are, so to address these criticisms the Food Systems Summit really needs to work more closely with the CFS and reference various tools, and bring in the CFS Chair for example to the Advisory Committee. Listen closely to the CSM or listen to the civil society groups in the way that the Committee on World Food Security does, and recognize the wealth of rooted insights that farmers movements and civil society can give to this process, rather than just picking the people that get to speak on their behalf. But I think those apply widely as well, not just to the Food Systems Summit.

Clare Shine

I think that's right, in a sense, you've just reminded us of the blueprint for effective multilateral and multi-stakeholder negotiations.

So, wrapping up this part of the program and recognizing that of course, a vast amount is in the chat box rather than being a recap right here, Teresa's final comments reminded me: if you're not at the table, you're on the menu, as we sometimes hear – undercutting a lot of the conversation related to power, and the shifting dynamics between people and power, not only in a democratic sense, but also the whole way in which choices are made and resources are allocated. We heard some interesting calls to action or key points there.

For Million, the importance of *slow*, we sometimes at Salzburg Global hear ourselves called slow food for the mind, and it can be so hard in the world on speed to think about the complexity and multi-layered menu of systems change.

Saswati was eloquent about the importance of holistic approaches that really understand the shifting dynamics, and perhaps also respect, where change is happening within those systems and how we can optimize those change trajectories.



Andrea spoke importantly about challenging assumptions which underlies so much of the way we do business legitimately, our norms, our parameters, as I said at the beginning. And in particular, highlighted the importance of respect and a rights-based approach as part of that new paradigm.

Andre, of course speaking to the question of negative externalities, which gave rise to one of the really important conversations, running through the Q&A and for myself. I hear how the term concepts and initiatives that seem to carry great hope and optimism can then show their cracks, as they start to be put into practice. And that eternal vigilance is also part of the spirit of collective intelligence and appreciative inquiry that we are all engaged in.

It's brilliant now to hand back to Ruth, because she's going to be speaking to those on the very front line of these two international processes: Nigel Topping and Martin Frick. Ruth, the screen is yours again.

Ruth Richardson

Great, thank you so much Clare. Really fantastic discussion amongst the five speakers and also in the chat box and the Q&A box, so thank you everybody for really weighing in on this. I just want to hold up what I heard just in terms of the kind of convergences and divergences very quickly. I think in terms of convergences, everybody is calling for a desire for more healthy, nutritious, sustainable, and low carbon food systems. I think there are common threads around the fact that the global industrial system is not fit for purpose, and there are multiple pathways to get there, but we've heard a lot about agroecology and regenerative agriculture, the importance of indigenous peoples and smallholder farmers, and that those principles that I mentioned at the beginning of the call, had been highlighted. But each step by each of the speakers, particularly – inclusion, equity, food, sovereignty, just transition, human rights – are very strong themes around the need to ground down a quick list that will not be comprehensive. For instance, realigning incentive mechanisms, concerns around net zero and carbon offsets, real concerns around inclusive and participatory processes, especially with underrepresented voices like women, smallholder farmers, indigenous peoples in the Global South.

There was talk about false arguments and a real need for holistic analysis and systemic solutions. Of course there's some concern around power imbalances, and policy incoherence, this reminds me that at the Global Alliance we use something called [Blue Marble Evaluation](#). *Blue Marble Evaluation* is an approach to evaluation that is fundamentally anchored in systems-thinking and breaking down silos, integrating separated functions, connecting people in places and creating linkages over time. And one of the guiding principles of *Blue Marble Evaluation* is that tensions cannot always be resolved, but they can be held, and they can be elevated as the basis for working toward understanding and possible breakthrough solutions.

Taking this principle, everything from the previous sessions and looking ahead to next year's Global Processes, let's now turn to this session to hear from [Martin Frick](#) and [Nigel Topping](#) for their responses and where they see opportunities for alignment and potential collective action. First, just a brief introduction, Martin Frick is the Deputy to the Special Envoy for the UN Food Systems Summit 2021, and Nigel Topping is the [High-Level Climate Action Champion](#) of the UK for COP26. And just to say on this, the role of the High-Level Climate Action Champion is to strengthen collaboration and drive action from

business investors, organizations, cities and regions on climate change and coordinate this work with governments and parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change.

So, Martin, I'd like to start with you. Responding to the hopes and the concerns raised during the previous panel discussion, what is the Secretariat of the United Nations Food Systems Summit doing to support collaboration, and what channels are there for non-state actors to engage and influence discussions amongst policymakers?

**Martin Frick**

Thank you, Ruth. Let me start by what we are not doing. We are not cooking any policy outcome with any big players. We are not driving the secret agenda. I think one of the main fundamental misunderstandings, is that, because the Secretary-General has announced this process a year ago, and a full year has passed, that basically everything has already been discussed and cleared. I heard the allegation that we just bring stakeholders in to make this thing look good. Honestly, our [Action Tracks](#) have started right now, it has taken an awful long time. One of the reasons was COVID and other reasons were all the political mechanics behind getting the different regional crews to nominate their actors for the Advisory Group. This is all unfortunate, but the fact is, we are only starting now.

We have the Action Tracks set up and only this afternoon, we have the first open forum, which is a listening exercise for [Action Track Number One](#) on access to safe and nutritious food for everyone. And every single one of these Action Tracks will open fully up to openly discuss the basis of these discussions around five framing papers, which are online. At this stage until basically Christmas, we are simply asking questions to get the framing right or if we forgot something. And we are looking for input. This is where we are. Nothing is precooked.

Five Action Tracks, each form more than 30 people, approximately 150 people in total, and one person from the [World Economic Forum](#), one out of 150. We want to put online who are in the leadership teams and funnily enough, we are not allowed to put that on the UN website for data protection. So, we are working feverishly on an online platform that gives us an open workbench for the Action Tracks that all of this is being put out. All of that means our own framing papers, the input we have received, the revised action, the revised framing papers, the scientific papers, the full work in full transparency. This is where we are now.

Let me start with a couple of things that I have heard in every framing document of the Food System Summit; you will find that it starts with the notion of our food systems are broken. I think we all share the understanding that we cannot go on as we did, and the fundamental misunderstandings and the reason, and the fundamental issues that we have to address here are really, and one word came up I haven't heard, but for me it's the central one: it's climate justice. Because we are dealing with smallholder farmers, we are dealing with people that would bear a multitude of burdens and as the United Nations, and as an [SDG Summit](#), this one is under the premise of leaving no one behind. And in order to establish climate justice the central entry point is supporting smallholder farmers, because it makes sense in every single perspective. It makes sense out of a rights perspective because basic human rights of these farmers are not being guaranteed. It makes sense in the climate justice perspective because the climate impacts smallholder farmers, indigenous peoples, fisher-folk, and forest dwellers. Everybody is suffering and it is

not caused by them, but it also makes sense because we have to balance our carbon budget and indigenous peoples are a wonderful example on how you can live for thousands of years within a balanced carbon cycle.

And it's only in the last decades that it's out of whack, and several points here: the linkage to the [UNFCCC Process](#), for me it's a natural and I've been in climate for the last 13 years. Until recently I was the Senior Director of UNFCCC, and for example in [Action Track Three](#), we speak about nature positive production, which is basically the way that indigenous peoples are producing and that we have stopped doing. We have, for example, in Phnom Penh, one of the two co-chairs of substance that is looking into joint work on agriculture. There is a purpose of biodiversity in [Action Track Number Five](#), we have [Sandrine Dixon-Declève](#) from the [Club of Rome](#) as a Vice Chair in Santorini, fantastic work with the leaders pledging on biodiversity that was just making headlines.

I think Andrea quoted [Olivier De Schutter](#), saying that nothing impacts food security more than climate change. Well yes, absolutely. And that is one of the key points why we are speaking about a Food Systems Summit, not only a Food Summit. Now, there is the big food community, there's the Committee for Food Security that has not only done groundbreaking work for food and food systems, for example the [Voluntary Guidelines on Tenure](#), which I think will be one of the key products that we are putting on the higher level with this Summit, but it has always been a trailblazer for participation of civil society. Now, we have been inviting civil society, all along. And maybe we haven't done that in the most apt way.

So, we went three steps back, reached out to the Committee on Food Security again, and looked into how we can intensify our cooperation. And one of the key points of the civil society mechanism is something I dare say that was never challenged. We were asking people to participate to get their expertise but did not cherry pick. And so, we are currently offering the civil society mechanism. An institutional seat in every single Action Track and by institutional, it means someone is the chair and you decide who will be sitting on this chair.

Two more points I wanted to do. One, nature-based solutions – yes that gives me a stomachache as well. We are all nature; we would not even be here without nature. Nature is not a solution out there like an electric car. It is the basis of everything. And, this nature-based solution space just simply will never work unless it works for the people and people live on a piece of land and if this is being challenged or the chapter dies it doesn't bring us anywhere. As for carbon capture storage, I have yet to see after more than a decade of experience in the field, a single thing that actually does work. The only carbon capture that really works is called photosynthesis and that is with us for 3.5 billion years. And that is something that we are propagating – should that be on the expenses of people? Hell no, it should be working for people. And in an ideal world it helps us to give a bit more additional income for smallholder farmers.

Last point, and I think Nigel will come on this one as well: it is most certainly not an excuse for what's going on in the fossil fuel industry, and to keep it happily burning, and believing that we can offset everything and that we don't have to change.

We are, and I have seen that coming over 15 years now, increasingly at a stage where we don't have any choices anymore. We need any bit of climate solution out there, we need it in parallel, we need it in

tandem. And we need it as fast as ever possible and I think framing the whole thing as a Race to Zero is just exactly right. And I think I spoke too long, but I give it back to Ruth and I'm very happy to answer your questions. Thank you.

#### Ruth Richardson

Thank you, Martin. Important point, so I let you take some time to think. They're all very important points to touch on, but let's turn to Nigel. Nigel, I essentially have the same question for you, responding to the hopes and the concerns raised during the previous panel discussion. What, in your experience in role, would you recommend the Secretary to the COP26 Presidency do in order to engage in collaborative action? What channels are there for non-state actors to engage and influence discussions amongst policymakers? And what unique elements do non-state actors bring to the table that these policy bodies cannot do without it?

#### Nigel Topping

Okay, great. Ruth, Clare, thank you so much for the framing and thank you for the Global Alliance for the Future of Food and Salzburg Global Seminar for creating and curating this dialogue. I think I'll dodge the first question, because I'm not the Presidency right mouth. My role is an international role, mandated by the parties, to work with civil society, private sector, and local governments globally. And because the Presidency's real job is to manage the negotiations, the very formal way along with the Secretary – I would just say that I really appreciate your framing of this as a wicked problem and as a systemic transformation problem.

It's the approach that [Gonzalo Muñoz](#) and I are trying to really bring into the [Marrakech Partnership](#), which is the structure which we have inherited and have been mandated to improve. So, I think when we publish our plans for the next stage of High-Level Champions work, you'll see that some of the language around dialogue and systems transformation, are all over it. I hope you'll like that. And I think it's also worth saying that we really understand – that perhaps nowhere more than in the food system – is there a complex nexus of issues on climate food, power asymmetries, health and development issues. And I think that, particularly because of those power asymmetries this dialogue process, which gives us some space – I think Million talked about slowing down a little bit. Although this is a race sometimes, we have to slow down to listen, I like the way you describe that.

We need persistence transformation; we need listening; imagination; and courage. And that includes the courage to recognize that maybe one has been wrong in one spirit assumptions. That's something that one has been pushing that hasn't worked. So, just channels or non-state actors to engage. Well, it's something that comes out and I'm working really hard to develop these dialogues as part of that. I mean this is a first we've had in the two weeks of Race to Zero dialogues.

We very consciously call it a race because there's a sense of urgency zeros that is obvious. Zero is just a staging point on the way to regenerative economies and regenerative agriculture in particular, but the dialogue is really important to us. We're not trying to have a debate where one side wins and the other side loses, we're actually trying to open up a space to respectfully listen to different perspectives because we think that's the only way – that's the way that learning comes in. We're quite stuck, collectively, right now we can't kid ourselves that there's a smooth pathway that we all agreed on, on how we unstick and

solve these problems that we've got. We've got to listen, we've got to find imagination, we've got to have courage.

So, one way of opening up involvement, and we've worked really hard, we maybe haven't gone far enough but I think we've made diversity of voices, a prerequisite for any partners curating these dialogues and you've certainly carried it off beautifully. I think you see across the two weeks; we've seen more diversity than we normally have in climate conversations. We also work very closely with TED on the [Countdown Initiative](#) and again, worked really hard to make sure there's more diversity there than normal. I think that we are publishing the second generation of net zero pathways, which Gonzalo Muñoz as a farmer and circular economy pioneer is my fellow Champion from Chile.

And so, we're hoping to make those pathways dynamically part of the conversation because we think we can converge on pathways. I think this idea of highlighting tensions and that aiming to converge and the way that André talked about both civil society and private sector converging in Brazil, we can converge on pathways. It's very difficult to risk them – the actions that everyone needs to take, so that we can go at the pace, and scale that we need to get to.

And so our aim will be to use these pathways and build dialogues with you and many other partners next year so that by the time we get to COP we hope that the dialogue is much further advanced in the sense of converging on pathways is much further advanced clearly in some sectors of the economy. We'll be able to get to convergence much faster than others. Which is why I'm so pleased that the Food Systems Summit is happening next year because I think we definitely need more attention to this part of the economy; 25 percent of the problem, 30 percent of the solution just ran mitigations point of view and of course crucial to resilience as well, let me just say a couple of things about the unique role of non-state actors, I think there's lots that have been brought out, one which Teresa mentions is the sort of accountability, to make sure we don't have one sector, or one voice getting carried away thinking that it's defined.

So, I really agree about the need for caution with net zero. But I'd say there are two sources of goods, two ways to be cautious. I mean in the Race to Zero we've been working with Oxford University with a very rigorous transparent process to make sure that we only embrace in the Race to Zero initiatives, which are very clear about driving real reductions in line with the science with an emphasis on short-term action so no 2050 targets, without any 510-year targets and with a rigorous approach to negative emissions, which means that they can only be considered if people are already reducing in line with the science and then to a residual. And yes, there's definitely greenwash out there at the moment, that organizations are saying we are net zero, we are climate neutral without any commitment to actually reduce their full value chain of emissions.

So, I would point to some recent papers by the science-based targets initiative and by Oxford University, which lean into that question. I don't think we finished the conversation yet but it's a really important one. I think that the non-state actors really helped change the politics by demonstrating practical solutions. When non-state actors converge, when we have civil society matters, investors, and businesses converging, it does make it much easier for policymakers to shift. Because ultimately, they pay a lot of attention to citizens and private sector in particular. I think, also, there's an opportunity to learn faster

when we recognize that there are multiple levels of innovation and experimentation. I see that particularly in work with local governments that devolved authority, often allowing for faster experimentation that can then go spread learning, much, much faster.

If you'll indulge me with a quote actually because I think I've just been thinking about your principles and about, perhaps nowhere more than the food system is this transformation we're talking about. A question of shared humanity, as well as qualities of listening, imagination, and courage, which requires humility to listen to others and be wrong and be prepared to admit that I think we need a spirit of solidarity.

Above all, and I just came across a wonderful quote – for many of us a great teacher in thinking about systems – [Donella Meadows](#) who said: *“Living successfully in a world of complex systems means expanding [...] the horizons of caring. [...] No part of the human race is separate either from other human beings or the global ecosystem. It will not be possible in this integrated world for [...] the rich in Los Angeles to succeed if the poor in Los Angeles fail, or for Europe to succeed if Africa fails, or for the global economy to succeed, if the global environment fails.”* I think the previous speakers have all said that quote in their own words.

The last thing I'd say is that Gonzalo and I, really conscious that we've been able to put together a stronger team to support the non-state actor agenda within the UN construct this year, because of where we sit. But the future Champions and Presidents will come, the next two will come from Africa and then the Pacific. So, we're working really hard to put in place an infrastructure that will support future Champions so that their work continues, rather than spiking. In particular, we're looking to see what we can do to extend our team to have an African presence, those will be supporting and working with the ecosystem of non-state actors in Africa, given the importance of Africa, and the fact that the next Presidency will come from Africa for COP27. Thank you.

[Ruth Richardson](#)

Great. Wow, and Nigel thank you for bringing Donella Meadows into the conversation. One of my favorites. We don't have much time left and I see that some questions have come into the Q&A and they've been answered bilaterally so that's great. I think just maybe just to close off a few thoughts from each of you. You have clarified the processes, to some extent, you've talked about some of the missteps and some of the good steps that you've been trying to follow within each of these processes. Nigel you talked quite eloquently about the roles of non state actors, some of those roles bringing forward solutions kind of changing the dialogue and the debate. Clare asked each of our panelists what is their call to action for these global processes and I'd like to give you the same opportunity on a very individual level, what is your “call to action” or what is your sort of request of those online today in terms of getting engaged and/or really trying to influence and inform these processes in a very positive way. So maybe just a few minutes each, on what you would ask of the folks listening today in terms of really trying to lead these processes in a good positive, constructive direction. So, Martin, let me start with you.

[Martin Frick](#)

Well, thank you and sorry I understand I made a lot of noise with my papers before so I won't touch them. The call to action is simply to get involved, please, to get involved, inside the process. Work with us, because we can guarantee and we can work to have an open and independent platform but people have



to use it. And you know, we have the possibility to speak about food systems as a system and that means we have to engage *everybody*. And of course this is a UN Summit, so our member states are playing a strong role, but I want to emphasize two things. One is that the calls to action that will come out of the Action Tracks are not exclusively called to member states. These are codes for everybody and we will be looking in building coalitions and we need you to build these columns. And the second thing I want to say is, although we are speaking about the Food Systems Summit, it really is an at least one year engagement process. And this process has started now, and it will come to all of the member states of the United Nations in the form of the Food Systems Summit dialogues, to get involved also nationally in these dialogues. And let's work together on the synergies here, so that our food system summit dialogues lead to strong and ambitious national determined contributions, and that the NDC discussions also help us building communities that holistically look into food systems that would be my call to action.

Ruth Richardson

Great, thank you. Martin and Nigel the last minute goes to what would you put out as your request to the folks on the call today.

Nigel Topping

Well, first of all, I'll put a link in the chat. We've talked a bit about sources of tension or tradeoffs, it's a great way of thinking about what [Bill Sharpe](#), one of my systems thinking mentors, has taught me, called strategic dilemma thinking. So for example on the offset question: I think we want robust standards so we don't have perverse unintended consequences. But I think we might also want billions of dollars flow to forest communities. Right, so let's find a way to have both of those. Right, so I'll post that link. So, my call to action is, actually, for every single entity in the world to join the race to zero and make a robust commitment to transition, and we'll be launching a race for resilience. It really does make a difference already seeing it politically making a difference in schools, University sports clubs, churches, businesses investors, cities and regions. We think it has already had a big impact in Japan which is now committed to net zero 2050, when they're over half of the population via their cities committing to net zero, and a couple of hundred companies putting pressure on as well. Please engage with this. The process that Gonzalo and I are mandated to run at the Marrakech Partnership is open for people and organizations to join. Many of you on here are already part of that process, we're trying to really up the levels of energy and specificity so engage with the pathways. Tell us what's good about them and critique them. We're publishing version 2.0 now and we'll aim to do a 2.1 probably May or June next year. And then I think that for me the real call to action is to be committed to converging, which means to listen, listening to people you know you don't agree with, and then finding what's common in humanity to find where we can actually converge. Thank you.

Ruth Richardson

Great note to end on. Thank you Nigel, thank you Martin, and with that I will pass it back over to Clare.

Clare Shine

Thank you, Ruth, Martin, Nigel and all our speakers and audience for such great levels of engagement on tricky controversial topics where we're coming at this debate from very different perspectives. And some things that stayed in my mind as I tried to wrap up one the need to change the narrative, as well as the policy and action framework. And as we just heard from Nigel, think about changing the demand

landscape, how do we make current practices and damage levels part of history just as other things have changed in our social attitudes like smoking and so much else. Critical reappraisal of key terms, understanding how terms may have cracks in them, or have been co-opted for different purposes, and to be bolder to go beyond the doctor's mantra of first do no harm to active committed regeneration, some critical points of action that came out. The transformation to healthy nutritious sustainable and low carbon food systems is our Holy Grail.

But that requires a holistic and integrated food systems approach that really connects climate change and food security recognizes the interconnectedness of land use food systems, health, climate change, equity and rights and puts multi stakeholder collective action and public private collaboration, as an integral part of systems change. We heard very important information about the shift to agroecological regenerative modes of farming. The importance at the very center of new systems of smallholder farmers and fishers of women of indigenous peoples with due respect for their rights and their traditional knowledge, and although that was less of a focus in this conversation, the issue of promoting less and better meat. As part of our food consumption practices principles that Ruth highlighted at the beginning that underpin this transformation include inclusion, equity, food sovereignty and a right to food, but also cultural respect as a foundation of collective action. Some of the specific needs that different speakers or questioners have raised is the importance of scrutinizing net zero climate targets by governments and corporations to prevent climate washing to reassess vested interest in growth and maximizing profit versus public good, and environmental and climate, and social justice to reappraise the role, and the footprint of industrial agriculture, and to realign incentive mechanisms to be pro health, and pro sustainability, understanding the win-wins, and even for productive economies that go with that realignment, the importance of genuinely participatory processes that will include currently underrepresented voices. That is an imperfect summary but it's already a very full agenda and the people on this call and the networks they represent a fundamental to progress.

I was grateful that Nigel picked up on my three words about imagination, listening and courage, but I pick up in turn on his reference to humility. I would also add empathy. I think that understanding that real leadership comes from many spaces, not only from the margins, and the courage to shift practice when you already influence the trillions is as much an act of courage as courage for real and radical change from the streets. So, let us go forward with empathy, boldness and vision, and in concluding COVID does need to be and can be a real wake up call. It has reminded us of our interdependence as well as systemic risk, the interconnection of climate change, biodiversity loss and pandemic risk was not new. Scientists have drawn our attention to it for a long time, but it is now in the news, and that I hope can be something we harnessed for good to come out of these terrible risks around us right now. So thank you again for your participation. And I'd like to close by quoting a different person. A Salzburg Global Fellow [Stacey Abrams](#), who, with others, lead a very important campaign of participatory engagement in the state of Georgia – whose book is titled “the time is now”, and that's what I would close with. Thank you all, and I look forward to staying involved in these discussions. Bye bye for now. Thank you.

Ruth Richardson

Thank you everyone. Bye bye!