

1. Rapport från den tredje tematiska dialogen med globalt perspektiv: *Åtgärdsområde 3. Att stärka naturpositiv livsmedelsproduktion – för människorna och planeten*

Under 2021 kommer världens länder att samlas och delta i FN:s första toppmöte någonsin om livsmedelssystem (Food Systems Summit, FSS) för att diskutera och starta en omställning av livsmedelssystemen. Dagens livsmedelssystem har allvarliga brister, vilket leder till hunger, undernäring och överkonsumtion samt allvarliga konsekvenser för både klimat och miljö. Omfattande förändringar behövs för att ställa om livsmedelssystemen så att de blir hållbara, motståndskraftiga och inkluderande så att de kan bidra till att uppfylla målen för hållbar utveckling. Alla FN:s medlemsstater har uppmanats att hålla nationella dialoger som förberedelse inför toppmötet. Totalt har Sverige arrangerat sju dialoger: en nationell dialog, två regionala och tre med fokus på Sveriges roll i det globala livsmedelssystemet och att bidra med globala perspektiv på Sveriges förberedelsearbete. De tre sistnämnda dialogerna fokuserade på globala perspektiv bland annat från aktörer kopplade till svenskt utvecklingssamarbete.



Sveriges tredje och sista globala FSS-dialog ägde rum den 11 maj 09.00–12.15 och arrangerades av Regeringskansliet, Sida, SIANI, Focali, SLU Global och AgriFoSe2030. Denna dialog fokuserade på FSS åtgärdsområde 3 och följande visionsmening diskuterades: *"En naturpositiv livsmedelsproduktion som bidrar till tryggad livsmedelsförsörjning och samtidigt skyddar naturliga ekosystem och biologisk mångfald samt rehabiliterar degraderade landskap/havsområden."*

För att ytterligare fördjupa diskussionen ställdes följande frågor: *Vilka avvägningar måste göras och vilka är de största hindren för att uppnå visionen? Hur relaterar detta till*

Sverige – vilken roll har vi i detta? Hur kan vi tillgodose alla människors rätt till livsmedel inom planetens gränser?

Visionsmeningen och frågorna diskuterades under en timme i mindre grupper med hjälp av en samtalsledare. Under diskussionen rådde *Chatham House*-regler, för att ge en trygg atmosfär åt dialogen. Det innebär att anteckningarna anonymiseras och inga direkta citat återges i rapporteringen. Alla samtalsledare fick utbildning i denna metod före dialogen. De viktigaste synpunkterna från gruppdiskussionerna finns sammanfattade i denna rapport. Anteckningar från respektive grupp finns i Bilaga 1.

De två andra tematiska dialogerna med globalt perspektiv var:

- Dialog 1 – Vägarna mot jämlika livsmedelssystem, som hölls den 29 mars
- Dialog 2 – Livsmedelsförsörjning, konflikt och motståndskraft, som hölls den 29 april

Information om Sveriges förberedelser inför FSS och information om alla dialoger finns på den svenska regeringens hemsida. Nyheter och videoinspelningar från öppningssessionerna av de tre globala dialogerna finns på SIANI:s hemsida.

1.1 Beskrivning av dialogens förberedelser och genomförande

Dialogen utformades och genomfördes i linje med den strategi och metod som presenterats av toppmötets dialogsekretariat. Planeringsgruppen hade regelbundna möten och rådfrågade Regeringskansliets arbetsgrupp för toppmötet om synpunkter och godkännande under planeringsprocessen. Genom en enkät rådfrågade planeringsgruppen aktörer inom civilsamhället, svenskt utvecklingssamarbete och den akademiska världen om förslag på talare, vilka frågor som skulle diskuteras samt förslag på vilka som skulle bjudas in till dialogen.

Curator för planering och genomförande av denna dialog var Maria Ölund, Projektledare för Focali och samarbeten mellan Focali och SIANI, vid Göteborgs centrum för hållbar utveckling GMV. Dialogen modererades av Maria Ölund samt Anneli Sundin, kommunikationsansvarig för AgriFoSe2030 vid Stockholm Environment Institute.

Inledande talare var Marija Milivojevic, kansliråd med ansvar för FAO, Näringsdepartementet. Hon välkomnade deltagarna och informerade om processen fram till toppmötet och hur synpunkterna kommer att användas av den svenska regeringen i olika processer. Sedan presenterades en videohälsning från Ulrika Modéer, assisterande generalsekreterare och chef för FN:s utvecklingsprogram UNDP:s avdelning för externa relationer och påverkansarbete i New York. Hon betonade att dialogerna kommer att fortsätta i form av ett partnerskapsinitiativ efter toppmötet.

Inledningen av dialogen omfattade två sessioner med paneldiskussioner. Den första sessionen fokuserade på de viktigaste utmaningarna i det nuvarande globala livsmedelssystemet och de förändringar som krävs för att ta itu med problem relaterade till otrygg livsmedelsförsörjning, hälsa, miljö och ojämna maktfördelning. Den första talaren var Estrella Penunia, generalsekreterare för Asian Farmers' Association for Sustainable Rural Development. Hon tog upp de viktigaste utmaningarna och behoven för de 13 miljoner lantbrukare som hennes organisation representerar, för att de på ett hållbart sätt ska kunna producera tillräckligt med mat för direkt konsumtion men även för vidare försäljning. Den andra talaren var Emile Frison, ledamot i International Panel of Experts on Sustainable Food Systems, IPES-Food och Africa Europe Foundation Agriculture Strategy Group, som tog upp de förändringar som krävs och de inlåsnings effekter som finns i det nuvarande globala livsmedelssystemet. Därefter kopplade Martin Persson, docent vid Chalmers tekniska högskola, dessa utmaningar till Sverige, genom att ge en bild av hur konsumtionen i Sverige påverkar den globala miljön.

Nästa session fokuserade på goda exempel på hållbara metoder från olika delar av världen. Under denna session talade Million Belay, General Coordinator, Alliance for Food Sovereignty in Africa (AFSA); Amy Ickowitz, Senior forskare och team ledare, Sustainable Landscapes & Livelihoods vid Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR) i Bogor, Indonesien och Richard Bimaronda, projektledare för programmet Marine Ecosystems and Fisheries vid Community Action for Nature Conservation (CANCO), Kenya. På olika sätt betonade alla paneldeltagare vikten av lokala livsmedelssystem som ger näringsrik mat utan att ha en negativ påverkan på ekosystemen. Att ta itu med drivkrafterna bakom förstörelsen av ekosystem och behovet av att återställa landskap och havsområden för ökad livsmedelstrygghet och resiliens var ytterligare perspektiv som togs upp, liksom att lära av befintliga "naturpositiva" metoder för livsmedelsproduktion som har använts under lång tid av lokalsamhällen och urbefolkningar såsom agroekologiska metoder och skogsbaserade livsmedel.

Öppningssessionen livestreamades via SIANI:s Facebook-sida, och inspelningen finns här.

1.2 Workshopsession – deltagare, metodik och återrapportering

Syftet med workshopsessionen var att bidra med ett globalt perspektiv från olika delar av livsmedelssystemet, t.ex. aktörer kopplade till svenskt utvecklingssamarbete och deras samarbetspartners. Bland de inbjudna var nationella och internationella representanter från myndigheter/offentlig sektor, civilsamhället, den privata sektorn, den akademiska världen, intresseorganisationer samt enskilda jordbrukare.

Under dialogen deltog 125 personer i öppningssessionen. De cirka 95 personer som stannade kvar under workshopen delades in i åtta grupper. Visionsmeningen som presenteras ovan användes som utgångspunkt för diskussionen, och de fyra frågorna

nedan användes för att vägleda och fördjupa diskussionen. Diskussionerna dokumenterades av en sekreterare i varje grupp. De viktigaste punkterna från gruppdiskussionerna presenterades vid återrapporteringen.

1. Vilka avvägningar krävs och vilka huvudsakliga hinder finns för att nå den övergripande visionen?
2. Förslag på hur dessa utmaningar ska hanteras (baserat på din kunskap/erfarenhet).
3. På vilka sätt är detta relevant för Sverige – vilken roll har vi i detta (positivt och/eller negativt)?
4. Vad kan Sverige göra för att bidra till att nå den övergripande visionen eller hantera dessa avvägningar?

Esse Nilsson, Ämnesföreträdare för Lantbruk och livsmedelsförsörjning på Sidas enhet för tematiskt stöd, avslutade mötet med kommentarer och reflektioner om Sveriges globala dialoger och vägen framåt mot FSS. Deltagarna informerades om möjligheten att bidra med ytterligare kommentarer genom att skicka e-post till n.fssdialog@regeringskansliet.se, och att ge synpunkter på dialogen i en enkät som skickades ut efter mötet.

1.3 Sammanfattning från gruppdiskussionerna

Denna sammanfattning baseras på anteckningarna från gruppdiskussionerna och inspelning av återrapporteringssessionen. Den lyfter fram viktiga frågor som togs upp av en eller flera grupper. Sammanfattningen sammanställdes av Maria Ölund, GMV och Katarina Börling, forskningssekreterare vid SLU Global. Anteckningarna från varje grupp presenteras i bilaga 1. Anteckningarna har justerats så att hänvisningar till individer eller aktörer har tagits bort, och mindre språkliga ändringar har gjorts.

1.3.1 Vilka avvägningar krävs och vilka huvudsakliga hinder finns för att nå den övergripande visionen?

Förslag på hur dessa utmaningar ska hanteras (baserat på din kunskap/erfarenhet)?

Det finns behov att ändra tankesätt för att inte bara fokusera på en ökad produktion utan också på produkternas kvalitet och hållbarhet i produktionen. I nuläget drivs miljöförändringar till stor del av ekonomiska intressen. Det finns också behov av omställning till ett systemtänkande, där produktionen relateras till hela livsmedelssystemet. Med en helhetssyn kan man undvika den typ av fragmenterade lösningar som uppstår om man arbetar i silos. Fokus på hållbarhet i både produktion, distribution och konsumtion är nödvändigt för att få hållbara livsmedelssystem. En cirkulär strategi är viktig för att skapa kretslopp och undvika överkonsumtion, och för optimalt utnyttjande av tillgängliga resurser.

Olika typer av styrmedel, såsom subventioner och skatter, diskuterades i flera grupper. I dag är subventioner främst inriktade på produktion och kvantitet, inte på kvalitet som näringsrik mat och hållbara produktionssystem. Att flytta fokus från kvantitet till kvalitet

tar tid. Förändringar behövs för att få större fokus mot subventioner som ökar resiliens i landskapet. Olika typer av certifiering och miljömärkning kan vara ett annat möjligt styrmedel. Ett naturpositivt perspektiv på produktionen kan åstadkommas genom certifiering och miljömärkning. Det finns dock en risk att de stora märkningssystemen blir dominerande på marknaden och de gynnar inte alltid lokala perspektiv och behov.

Det är viktigt att ta hänsyn till lokala förutsättningar när man jobbar på en viss plats, eftersom olika åtgärder är relevanta i olika landskap/havsområden och i olika sammanhang, beroende på lokala förutsättningar, traditioner, kulturella värden osv. Inkludering av de personer som berörs är extremt viktigt. Hänsyn behöver också tas till landskapet som helhet, dvs. naturpositiv livsmedelsproduktion kan inte bara fokusera på enstaka jordbruks- eller markområden utan måste se till hela landskapsbilden. Det är inte heller möjligt att enbart fokusera på bevarande; människor måste kunna dra nytta av marken. skogen och/eller havsområdena.

Flera grupper diskuterade också människors möjlighet till försörjning, lantbrukares/arbetares rättigheter och tillgång till mark, samt vikten av tydliga besittningsrättigheter. I arbete där flera mål adresseras, som t.ex. tryggad livsmedelsförsörjning och miljöskydd/återställande, finns behov att hitta strategier som även gynnar lokalbefolkningens möjlighet till försörjning, eftersom detta är högsta prioritet för den enskilde individen. Rätten och tillgången till mark är också avgörande för att kunna göra långsiktiga investeringar i hållbar markanvändning. Att inkludera småskaliga lantbrukare, fiskare, ursprungsbefolkningar, ungdomar och kvinnor i dialogen är mycket viktigt, liksom att dra nytta och anpassa till lokal kultur, lokala metoder och traditionella tekniker samt att skydda biologisk mångfald och lokala sorter/utsäde etc. Processen måste i mindre utsträckning ske uppifrån och ner och vara mer fokuserad på att lyssna på småskaliga lantbrukare och förstå deras produktionssystem, incitament och behov. Ojämlig maktfördelning i det nuvarande globala livsmedelssystemet togs upp av flera grupper, liksom behovet av att ge lokalsamhällen möjlighet att på olika sätt vara drivande i förändringen mot mer hållbara livsmedelssystem för både människor och miljö.

Att värdesätta och skala upp befintlig god praxis samt att införliva nya tekniker i nuvarande praxis diskuterades. Utbildning samt spridning och utbyte av kunskap är extremt viktigt. Lantbrukare och ursprungsbefolkningar behöver engageras och ges möjlighet till kunskapsutbyte. Det är viktigt att ha en strategi för hur forskningsresultat ska kunna nå de lokala lantbrukarna på fältet.

Flera grupper diskuterade behovet av att stödja agroekologiska metoder och principer, och att minska användningen av jordbrukskemikalier, vilket skulle gynna den biologiska mångfalden och förbättra förhållandena på tidigare förorenad mark, dessutom kan det förbättra möjligheterna till försörjning för lantbrukarna. Mer forskning behövs dock,

liksom exempel på hur det kan fungera i stor skala. Anpassning till klimatförändringarna och kopplingen till den biologiska mångfalden diskuterades också, liksom vikten av god vattenförvaltning vad gäller bevattning och dricksvatten, samt vikten av hållbar landskapsförvaltning för att ta tillvara vattenresurserna. Fördelarna med integrerade produktionssystem med en balans mellan animalie- och vegetabilieproduktion och en blandning av grödor och träd diskuterades.

Lokal livsmedelsproduktion och lokala marknader är viktiga och robusta, eftersom de inte är beroende av den globala marknaden, vilket blev tydligt under pandemin. Globala marknader och värdekedjor är dock ofta dominerande och har fördelar på grund av sin storskalighet. Ibland kan det vara svårt för småskaliga lantbrukare att få tillgång till, och överleva på en lokal marknad, eftersom man importerar stora mängder livsmedel i stället för att konsumera lokala produkter. Låg tillgång till marknader och dåligt fungerande värdekedjor kan vara en orsak till att livsmedel inte når konsumenten och inte utnyttjas på bästa sätt. Det är en global utmaning att lösa de dubbla problemen med osäker livsmedelsförsörjning och matsvinn. Beteendeförändringar krävs för att öka konsumtionen av lokalt producerade livsmedel, begränsa matsvinnet och därmed utnyttja det som produceras. Dessa dubbla utmaningar är också kopplade till den ojämna fördelningen av livsmedel globalt sett.

Småskaliga fiske- och kustsamhällen försörjer hundratals miljoner människor med livsmedel, men generellt saknas stöd för att uppnå deras potential inom den nationella livsmedelsförsörjningen, och detta behöver lyftas i diskussioner kring nuvarande och framtida livsmedelssystem. Stöd och finansiering riktas ofta till storskaliga industriella fiskeflottor. Den roll som havsområden, fisk och skaldjur spelar i livsmedelssystem behöver uppmärksammas mer.

Livsmedelsproduktionens verkliga kostnader redovisas sällan och det finns inga system för att betala för detta. Det är även problem med betalning för ekosystemtjänster. Även om det har gjorts försök och det finns bra exempel i liten skala, är det en utmaning att skala upp detta för att skapa ett globalt system.

1.3.2 På vilka sätt är detta relevant för Sverige – vilken roll har vi i detta?

Vad kan Sverige göra för att bidra till att nå den övergripande visionen eller hantera dessa avvägningar?

Sverige har makt att påverka och förändra det globala systemet. En global omställning behövs, och Sverige kan ta upp de globala utmaningarna kopplade till tryggad livsmedelsförsörjning i de internationella diskussionerna och bilda globala partnerskap. Sverige är framstående inom internationell diplomati och får därför hög trovärdighet när de arbetar tillsammans med andra länder i dessa frågor.

Sverige kan göra medvetna val vid import av livsmedel – med ovanstående visionsmening i åtanke – och kan också påverka andra EU-länder i fråga om

livsmedelsimport. Det är också möjligt att påverka genom att göra hållbara livsmedel billigare. Mer forskning behövs om hur Sveriges och EU:s finansiella makt och konsumtion kan utgöra konstruktiva krafter i en transformativ strategi.

Sverige kan föregå med gott exempel, t.ex. genom förbättrade förutsättningar för lokal produktion, utnyttjande av lokal kunskap och genom arbete med att sluta sina egna kretslopp. Kunskap om dessa frågor kan också delas och spridas inom och mellan olika nätverk. Sverige har en mycket stark djurskyddslag som kan visas upp som ett bra exempel. Sverige bör också arbeta med förbättringar i det svenska landskapet, till exempel när det gäller biologisk mångfald och balans mellan växt- och djurproduktion. Genom att fungera som förebild får Sverige mer trovärdighet över hela världen.

Utvecklingsbistånd spelar en viktig roll. Mer biståndspengar måste gå till organisationer som arbetar med tryggad livsmedelsförsörjning. Sverige bör fokusera på initiativ som stöder lokalt tryggad livsmedelsförsörjning, agroekologi, biologisk mångfald och biobanker. Stödet bör särskilt inriktas på kapacitetsuppbyggnad, civilsamhällets aktörer, sociala rörelser och lantbrukarorganisationer. Det är viktigt att stödja producenternas medverkan och deltagande och ge dem en röst vid bordet. Det är viktigt att inte bara representera småskaliga lantbrukare utan att även inkludera andra underrepresenterade grupper som småskaliga fiskare, kvinnor, ungdomar och ursprungsbefolkningar. Att visa exempel på hur svenska bönder är organiserade kan vara inspirerande. Sverige kan delta i den typ av diskussioner som för närvarande pågår inom Committee on World Food Security (CFS), där rapporter om agroekologiska och andra innovationer diskuteras.

Sverige kan vara en kritisk och stark röst i debatten, en ivrig aktör för mänskliga rättigheter, jämlikhet och rättvisa. Sverige bör fortsätta att stödja mänskliga rättigheter, markrättigheter och driva på för jämställdhet mellan könen. Det borde finnas en människocentrerad syn på lokala samhällen. Sverige har en mycket stark ställning vad gäller att värna mänskliga rättigheter, vilket är en bra grund för fortsatta diskussioner. Sverige kan förespråka rätten till mat, eftersom medborgare i många andra länder inte har en uppenbar rätt till mat. Det finns ett behov av att tänka i termer av hälsa och välbefinnande, och det finns nära kopplingar till kultur och livsstil. En viktig fråga att ta upp är kopplingen mellan konflikter och osäker livsmedelsförsörjning.

Det finns ett behov av att överbrygga klyftan mellan forskningsresultat, lokala erfarenheter och implementering. Plattformar som involverar universitet och organisationer i civilsamhället kan utgöra viktiga bidrag för kunskapsöverföring. Sverige har en bra position för att påverka och förespråka bättre politisk infrastruktur. Det är ständigt aktuellt att undersöka möjligheter till partnerskap, utveckling och vetenskapligt utbyte. Sverige har goda erfarenheter av breda nätverk och öppna dialoger mellan sektorer som andra länder kan lära av.

1.3.3 Övriga synpunkter som inkommit: kommentarer angående visionsmeningen

Visionsmeningen är revolutionerande, men också mycket svår att genomföra. För att uppnå visionen krävs samarbete mellan privata företag och institutioner på multilateral nivå. Många olika intressenter med institutionell makt, men också sociala rörelser, inklusive kvinnor, behöver involveras och processen behöver vara mer av en bottom-up-strategi. Visionen kombinerar nutid och framtid. Den stöder produktion av mat just nu, men lyfter samtidigt behovet av strategier för framtida generationer och behovet av att återställa landskap. Stora företag och bolag fokuserar ofta på kortsiktiga mål i stället för att ha ett långsiktigt perspektiv, och här behövs incitament för att tänka mer långsiktigt.

Visionsmeningen visar att livsmedelsproduktion inte handlar om ett fristående åtgärdsområde; det krävs tvärsektoriella åtgärder. Visionsmeningen är bred men inte alltför bred. En ytterligare reflektion gäller begreppet "naturpositivt" i förhållande till begreppet "hållbart", där naturpositivt uppfattas som mer konkret. Det är en annan/ny paraplyterm. Trots sin begränsning kan den nya termen "naturpositiv livsmedelsproduktion" vara ett bra sätt att testa nya ingångar, eftersom ingen av de tidigare använda termerna täcker in visionsmeningens hela sammanhang. De tidigare använda begreppen är också mycket omtvistade, och diskussioner och förhandlingar kring dessa ämnen tenderar att bli känsliga.

Förutom tryggad livsmedelsförsörjning bör visionsmeningen också innehålla något om näringsinnehåll, eftersom hälsoaspekten är viktig. I visionsmening saknas också mänskliga rättigheter och sociala och kulturella aspekter.

1.4 Bilaga 1: Anteckningar från respektive grupp

1.4.1 Group 1

What trade-offs or main barriers exist to reaching the overall vision?

- A trade-off or main barrier identified in the discussion is the *social movement* vs (or in combination with) *larger stakeholders*. The trade-off implies evaluation of the social scale (including women, and listening to farmers and fishers), and at the same time looking at the policy level. To reach the vision is highly complicated. There is a need for cooperation between private companies and multilateral level institutions. The vision statement is revolutionary in concrete terms but also extremely difficult to implement. There is a need for a strong movement. Social movement combining men and women is important. Money needs to be spent in the right way; it is possible to reach the vision if politicians have the will.
- Inclusion is another aspect mentioned. For example, commercial and agribusinesses have been underestimating the objective and historically looking at women's point of view; a big driver for women's entry is the autonomous income. Within the dimension of inclusion in terms of the environmental and health sector, it is crucial to make it possible for women to gain independent income. Moreover, focusing on the environmental impacts might lose the focus on other aspects. Possible ways for actions to reach the vision refer to implementing more bottom-up approaches, involving a variety of stakeholders with institutional power, but also the social movement, and including women. Another trade-off discussed is the focus on farmers' income vs farmers' nature-positive impacts; these two aspects could be seen as counterbalancing. Many companies are focusing on making money, not increasing the food quality for consumption.

Suggestions of how to handle these challenges (based on your knowledge/experience)?

- When looking for solutions and concrete actions: one suggestion is to give more power to the people and local communities, possibly in the form of cooperatives. With regard to how power can be given to the people and what is currently missing for it to happen, a possible solution is starting with the small initiatives, through cooperation of small associations and movements as well as sharing experiences. There is an initiative of carbon finance that could increase farmers' awareness, encouraging them to work in a sustainable manner. However, the initiative might not address the concerns of a broader population. The market could be steered in a direction for social security.
- The issue of land and natural resources was mentioned as a challenge. Nowadays, the issue of food security is not an issue of a particular region, but rather a global one. The aspect of land management or natural resource management, and nature-

positive food production is dependent on the issue of land. For example, in Tanzania there are problems of extensive land grabbing and long-term contracts; people have lower access to land as, since the colonial period, large amounts of it have been taken. This issue of land inaccessibility could be included in the global agenda in order for reform to be discussed and to ensure the contracts can be overturned and restarted. Access to land would support greater food production, making it possible to feed more of the population.

- Another issue concerns water management; the destruction of water sources necessitates people moving from one source to another, and further destruction of drinkable water. There is a need for global action to address the issue of irrigation; to provide more financial resources to make sure people can access water instead of moving from farms. In this matter, the infrastructure of irrigation systems is important, and could enhance positive food production. Commitment to nature-positive production lies in land utilization. Governments need to make wise use of the available land for food production. Governments can be inspired through an international legal framework. The dimensions discussed have been mirrored in some current projects, through local engagement, inclusion and gender equality.

How does this relate to Sweden – what is our role in this (positive and/or negative)?

- Sweden's role within this area is, among other things, related to policymaking. Sweden is a member of the EU, where the aspect of healthy and nutritious food is of importance. Therefore, Sweden could import food, having the vision in mind and influencing other EU states regarding food imports. Further, Sweden could play a role as a donor in terms of quality. Some countries within the UN are highly focused on increasing income and less focused on environmental aspects or protection of food. Sweden could work to balance that and influence other countries by talking more about nature-positive food production, focusing less on income. Sweden could thus raise the issues through discussions with global organizations. Some examples mentioned are telling a story and how it matters, case stories, and case studies. Changing behavior and changing minds are crucial within this aspect.

What could Sweden do to contribute to reaching the overall vision or handling these trade-offs?

- This question is closely connected to the previous one. Sweden can contribute to reaching the overall vision (and play a role) by collecting more quantitative data. The data could support the identification of indicators and be collected both nationally and globally, for comparison. Sweden could also contribute through nutrition recommendations, both in broader collaborations and in the national context. In order to support small fisheries to become more sustainable, it is

important to make sure they are provided with technological equipment, especially in developing countries. In developing countries there is a lack of knowledge; people are fishing without thinking about how they fish in the lakes. Sweden could provide the aid of modern technologies to help local communities to fish in a sustainable way. Lastly, Sweden could continue the support for people and land rights, steering the funding and supporting biodiversity seedbanks.

Other discussions

- The session started with discussing the understanding of the vision statement. Besides increased food security, the statement should also include the element of nutrition, as taking care of people's health is important. The statement combines the present and the future and supports us to produce food for current needs, but at the same time we need to think about future generations. We need to focus on how to restore degraded landscapes in a responsible manner, as well as halt further destruction and degradation. Big companies and corporations are focusing on food now, to make money now, transforming food into a commodity. An additional reflection of the concept regards the aspect of nature-positive vs sustainable, where nature-positive is perceived as more concrete. The discussion also included the aspect of food security and food sovereignty.
- Another aspect discussed were the fisheries. When we talk about agriculture, we often focus on crops and forget about small-scale fisheries. Community incentives and small-scale local fisheries play a critical role in terms of food production and providing income, supporting the local fisheries. As noted in the vision statement, both landscape and seascapes are included.

1.4.2 Group 2

What trade-offs or main barriers exist to reaching the overall vision?

- Many discussions around food systems fail to recognize the diversity of food sources. Aquatic foods are often overlooked in spite of their potential to contribute to sustainable healthy diets and as part of a solution to address the triple burden of malnutrition/ micronutrient deficiencies, undernutrition and obesity.
- Small-scale fisheries and coastal communities supply hundreds of millions of people with food, but in national food policies and in discussions around current and future food systems there is a general lack of support to enable them to fulfil their potential.
- Support and funding are directed towards large-scale industrial fishing fleets, which comes at the cost of coastal communities and their ability to get nutritious and affordable food.

- There is also competition for marine resources and a large quantity of fish goes to fish meal production to supply poultry or fish farms instead of being directed towards human consumption. This can be challenging for coastal communities, as seen especially during the COVID19 pandemic.
- The lack of infrastructure and technology, and focusing on creating and supporting local value chains, has been a major challenge over the past year.
- MPAs (marine protected areas) is one of the most popular tools for preserving biodiversity and many of the existing MPAs are working well. However, among the main issues with implementation is a lack of inclusion and participation at the local community level. The effects of MPAs might spill-over to surrounding areas, which in theory could increase fish catches for local people, but at the same time we see so many issues surrounding these MPAs.
- There is really a challenge here, in bringing the individual, communal, national and global levels together.
- Beef consumption is far too high in terms of our climate impact.
- There is as a global challenge to solve the simultaneous problems of food security and food waste. We need behavioral changes to limit food loss and food waste, so that we make better use of what we produce, but the dual challenges are also linked to the unequal distribution of food. For example, we see food producers who are food insecure in parallel with high levels of food waste and food loss. Lack of access to markets and malfunctioning value-chains is one reason that food is lost in the food system.
- Some problems we face are connected to a lack of technology, but there is also a lack of investment in infrastructure and capacity building.
- One participant brought up examples from Nepal, saying that South Asia suffers from a high use of chemicals in farming and agriculture, and that we have to prioritize reducing the use of chemicals in agriculture. In Nepal, agricultural policies do not prioritize organic farming. There is a lack of a holistic approach, and you see conventional farming and organic farming side-by-side. The chemicals then affect the organic farming, which cannot be promoted as organic.
- Another example brought up from Nepal is the issue that indigenous crop varieties are not supported by government policies, in spite of being nutritious and fitting well with the concept of 'nature-positive'. A nature-positive approach is not typically included in current commercial food production and is given low priority by the government. Consequently, biodiversity is decreasing, and nutritious food is lost.
- An issue in Nepal is that producers of, for example, honey cannot get a good price for their products on the market. Here, government support could benefit producers of nutritious foods and also support a nature-positive approach to food production.
- There is a need for systems thinking, which looks at production both relative to itself as well as relative to all the other parts within the food system.

- Food production itself is both a threat and also something that can easily be threatened by the ecosystems on which it depends.
- There is lack of connection between the different levels of the food system, such as over-emphasizing certain aspects of food production and under-prioritizing others. There are barriers related both to behavioral aspects and to a lack of systems thinking.
- Civil society organizations often experience conflicts with authorities but have also had great success in cooperating and working together with those same authorities. We need to both challenge authorities and apply pressure to achieve the changes we want to see, and at the same time recognize the value of cooperating with authorities. Collective training and education is one platform where civil society and authorities could find common ground. One important challenge that was discussed was that many of the suggestions for how to transform the global food system so that it becomes nature-positive are compatible with small-scale food producers and family farms, but the large-scale stakeholders and big corporations also need to support the transition.
- The question of how to assure that those benefitting from the status quo are also on board should not be forgotten.

Suggestions of how to handle these challenges (based on your knowledge/experience)?

- A local food production is very important, and in a way is more robust, because it is not dependent on global markets, so this is one important way forward.
- Small-scale fisheries and seafood production is very important to both preserve biodiversity and ensure that everyone has access to affordable and nutritious food.
- Systems thinking is key. There is a need for a holistic approach and to avoid fragmented or scattered approaches.
- The FAO guidelines for securing sustainable small-scale fisheries, built around 17 principles and on a landscape or seascape approach, is a very important tool for environmental work and poverty reduction, to make sure that everyone has affordable access to food, and for creating sustainable markets for small-scale fisheries.
- We need to work for more locally managed marine areas that are governed, developed, and managed by local communities.
- It is key to have incentives for a nature-positive approach on all levels. There has to be incentives for everyone, from the producers to the consumers, and for governments to actually promote these structures.
- We can lobby authorities in the different countries but also engage in awareness raising and apply pressure globally.
- We could be empowered by our own individual choices and by having conversations like these, during the Food Systems Summit. We can form

collaborations and organize ourselves because when we collaborate with each other we have greater influence in our societies. We also need to ensure that we are inclusive and that we welcome the perspectives of the younger generation.

- Secure land rights is key, but we should consider this broadly and think that it's not just about having security of our own; it is also about the entire community having security and influence over the landscape.
- The solution has to be holistic and include all of us. We cannot work in silos. A circular economy is something that we have to consider now in order to make the best use of the available resources.
- In the example from Nepal, we see the importance of valuing indigenous and local knowledge in order to strengthen food security and to improve nutrition..
- We can follow the landscape approach, meaning that if we want to have nature-positive food systems and food production we cannot think about isolated patches or isolated pieces of land. We need to think of the system and the landscape as a whole.
- There is also the importance of working together with farmers, together with authorities, together with all the involved stakeholders and at different levels, from the individual producers and consumers, the communities, and at national and international levels.
- We have ways of empowering ourselves and others. We can create change, for example by lobbying and applying pressure on our own governments and on other governments, to influence authorities and to bring about change for a nature-positive food system.

How does this relate to Sweden – what is our role in this (positive and/or negative)?

- Within Sweden, we could make sustainable food choice more affordable. One very simple example is that our beef consumption is far too high in terms of its climate impact. Just by changing our food consumption so that we eat less meat we could decrease our carbon emission.

1.4.3 Group 3

What trade-offs or main barriers exist to reaching the overall vision?

- Global markets and value chains are important. How to help the local market, finding mechanisms to fight against the big global actors? Sometimes it can be difficult to find and survive on a local market for small-scale farmers, and cities import a lot of food instead of consuming local produce.
- The speakers were all critical of how subsidies are working at the moment. They are working with emissions connected to production and use, then subsidies are connected to quantity instead of quality, which is negative. The main thing, then, will be to change subsidies and to change the way of looking at agriculture from

only economical terms. To view the way we use the land based on ecology instead of economy.

- Restoration is very popular and recently there has been many reports about restoration of African drylands. The most successful stories of restoration have been those where a bottom-up and grassroots approach has been used. We have to support these movements since it is clear that this is the most sustainable method and form of management in the long term. Many western NGOs try and want to support these movement; however, these often have a main focus on climate change when the main goal instead should be to improve local livelihoods. Farmers do not care about how much carbon is reduced, they care about water and food resources. We need to change our priorities in development, and how we communicate the problems. Livelihoods should be the primary focus.
- Everything is connected; you cannot address only one part of sustainability to succeed. Everything has to be approached together.

Suggestions of how to handle these challenges (based on your knowledge/experience)?

- The word 'landscape' is difficult to define simply. Often, if you choose to work on climate change in one part of the world then you can create problems in other places. Thus, we have to look at the landscape and see what values we put upon it and how we see it. When we look at solutions it is also important to look at the specific landscape that a solution should be applied to. Energy forests can be seen as sustainable; however, they are not sustainable in all aspects as the output has to be transported and thus becomes unsustainable if it is not used locally. This example shows us that we have to go back and see how we can use the local landscape instead. Rather than eating locally produced crops and vegetables, we consume a large amount of food today that has been produced far away and transported long distances.
- Biofuel is a difficult sector and there is a tendency to hide emissions. We hope that biofuel can save some countries, but it has become a trade-off that does not lead to the sustainable change that it claims. There has to be more opportunities for local governments to use and produce their local products. They need to have the rights and powers to govern these possibilities on their own, and they have to do it in the right way. More equality between the global south and north. The global food web should be seen as an ecologically important space to use in a sustainable way instead of only looking at it through the amount of carbon it produces. We have taken away the real purpose of food production today. To transform structures from a focus on production to an ecology focus will be difficult, we cannot cut all subsidies directly. We need slow changes, and to give increased subsidies to those who build resilience within their landscape. Those who make good changes should be rewarded.

- CAP has been devastating to many countries and regions. The agricultural subsidies should go mainly to young people. In Europe, you see large landscapes of monocultures that lack diversity. These are often owned by elderly people. Young people have to enter the business. Small farmers and young farmers and families have to be supported.
- Further, we need to promote another discourse that is more people positive. Today's narratives are either about conservation or people destroying the land. This is very negative; we have to change this view, we have to see that the best guardians of the forest are the indigenous people, they should not be removed but given the most beneficial conditions to govern it. People have the key role. We should propose a narrative that show that preservation doesn't have to be in conflict with development. These two could be connected and enabled by human interaction if they are guided in a sustainable way. We also have to start labelling products more correctly to give the consumers indicators of which foods are most beneficial.
- There is a problem that the attractiveness for young people to work in the food system is low; this has to be solved. Labelling is very good, but it can be difficult since it can take away local governance and agency. By implementing a labelling structure that people have to follow, there can be lock-in systems which makes them inflexible to change over time and dependent on today's truth and information. Then it can be difficult to apply new learnings and to be flexible. Fairtrade can be good but can also make it hard for farmers in the south to grow and be independent.
- Many development programs focus on value chains and overlook the local focus, and what is actually beneficial for livelihoods. We need to have a nature-positive perspective on production, such as agroecology, with its many benefits to livelihoods and biodiversity. But there is a need for supporting these initiatives and we need more research and examples for what has worked and how everything should proceed. We also have to learn from indigenous people how they have lived and worked together with the earth. A nature-positive perspective can be implemented through labelling. However, these large labelling methods risk dominating the market and not fully taking in local perspectives and needs.
- When looking at policies, there is the issue that biodiversity and agriculture are put against each other, but they have to work together.
- One of the problems with the global food system is our everyday lives. People are buying processed foods because they do not have time to buy food that takes time to cook. Our way of living today is not compatible to the development that has to be applied to food production and consumption. Thus, we have to take care of nature and people and promote healthy lives. But who is going to take care of the people and earth if no one has the time to do it?

How does this relate to Sweden – what is our role in this (positive and/or negative)?

- Many Swedish development projects in the global south look at how we can produce more and do it faster. The methods are based on Swedish models for success.

What could Sweden do to contribute to reaching the overall vision or handling these trade-offs?

- In Sweden we should push harder for this people-positive centric perspective, people's rights and needs should be primary in discussions. There should be a people-centric view on local communities.
- When we work with labelling, farmers guarantee that they and their neighbors use good methods. This can drive up the prices, but it assures that the farmers have some form of independency. When it comes to nature we should not be merely conserving; nature should be conserved for the people who live in the Amazon so that they can use the forest in their own sustainable way.
- Sweden should focus on initiatives that support and embrace agroecology and local food security, particularly focusing on capacity building, civil society actors and social movements. Not only representing small-scale farmers but also small-scale fishers, women and indigenous people. We also have to strengthen their own agencies and give them a voice at the table. Sweden has a very strong human rights approach in its programs, i.e. there are many beneficial tools, but these have to be thoroughly implemented. These are good basics to start with.
- The type of research that is funded is important. Many of the funded projects are mainstream agricultural research, much about GMO crops, and fertilizers. More support is needed for agricultural research that takes other types of directions.

1.4.4 Group 4

What trade-offs or main barriers exist to reaching the overall vision?

- Some challenges with the vision statement include land reclamation to make, for example, dry land and deserts productive. Another challenge is that many have experiences with farmers being isolated and not collaborating with each other.
- Sometimes there is a conflict between the actors in the value chain and the food market owners – how can we approach this?
- If you don't have land – how can you grow food?
- Low-income countries are expected to increase production due to population growth. How do we increase production without compromising nature?

Suggestions of how to handle these challenges (based on your knowledge/experience)?

- The vision is possible, but it requires that family farms be organized and are not alone. It is important that they can get support and advice from government and

organizations that are familiar with their work. The question is about focus and to focus on everything within the vision statement is only possible through collaboration. Several levels of collaboration are needed, as well as policies that support individuals.

- It is important to have a sustainable mindset in production, distribution, and consumption for food systems' sustainability. Gender equality is fundamental for the vision statement, as well as making use of young people and their interests.
- Forests provide large amounts of food and accepting that forests play an important part in feeding people will also contribute to saving forests from being cut down, for example to create more farmland.
- Listen to locals! They already have the knowledge, and we must make use of that. Agroecology is a method that is beneficial and would solve many of the problems related to the vision statement. Farmers often lack finances – investments need to not only be spoken of but to take place.

How does this relate to Sweden – what is our role in this (positive and/or negative)? What could Sweden do to contribute to reaching the overall vision or handling these trade-offs?

- One suggestion is to make use of Swedish government agencies and their expertise. Their hands-on techniques and hands-on education can be beneficial in the exchange of knowledge. This can also help to build transparent institutions.
- Another suggestion is to increase investments in the agricultural sector. Sweden has already done this, but we can do more. There can still be more knowledge on food production. We need monitoring but we also need to share that information.
- Some say that financial mechanism and frameworks are needed. Finance is king at the end of the day. Projects will not happen without resources. Sweden can give more money if we want to be a leading country in the global food system. But there are also hidden numbers – not everything is visible.
- Others argue for dialogue and collaboration. There are also power dynamics that we need to take into consideration. There needs to be more support to agriculture; little money reaches the farmer. We also need to increase the support to help farmers with threats, land rights and terror to decrease deaths among farmers.
- We need to tackle markets and trade policies that are not operating in favor of the smallholder. Land rights and climate change are not new subjects, but still important action points.
- There needs to be stronger linkages between Swedish agencies and agencies in other countries to increase collaboration.
- And how do we make it long-lasting? By creating structures based on knowledge.

Other discussions

- Another aspect that was discussed was the importance of knowledge. We need to involve indigenous groups in knowledge sharing and further inclusion needs to be made. It is also important to think about how knowledge will reach local farmers. How will knowledge from universities, for example, reach local people, and how will it benefit them? We need to get out of webinars to reach the fields.
- One solution could be to have an institutional framework for knowledge transfer. We must also look at how farmers organize themselves today and examine how they get access to knowledge. In some places it is through discussion groups, from organizations, ICTs, face-to-face, through classes, etc. A coordination framework is needed to facilitate knowledge transfer that works. We also need to package information so that farmers can access it easily. In universities we must do more for capacity building on how to spread the knowledge.

Group 5

What trade-offs or main barriers exist to reaching the overall vision?

- Unclear definition of the new term 'nature-positive food production' makes it more difficult for everyone to even have the same starting point to take certain actions.
- Sustainability will never be reached while we are looking in diversified ways and with bigger perspectives.
- Intensified solutions mean they will not be so sustainable. There are more trade-offs with sustainable intensification, but it is impossible to relate nature positivity to the need for intensifying food production systems.
- There is a problem with how the vision is crafted because, while a global-level framework is needed, it is necessary to look at systems from country to country and from region to region in terms of sustainable food systems.
- A big problem is to produce enough diverse food to feed larger cities. There are many local successful examples, but it is difficult to manage diverse sustainable systems on a larger scale. What kind of systems can we use to make it possible to produce enough through small-scale farming with a growing urban population?
- It is difficult to include the locals as the food industry and food systems are already organized within their own systems.
- Food productions, in terms of agrochemicals and the likes, are not good for humans or the environment, but manufacturers are not perceived as ethically responsible.
- Lack of instruments that control and monitor manufacturers.
- Large retailers and companies are brought up as a barrier to implement more sustainable policies and practices as they have a lot of power on the global market.

- It is impossible to achieve nature-positive food production with the current system and the existing agrochemicals.
- Lack of cultural aspects in the vision statement. Culture is critical in relation to food systems, diversity in farming practices, female and male-dominated food processing; everything is connected to culture.
- Lack of the importance of social sciences and having an interdisciplinary approach to food systems in general, and the vision in particular.
- The right to food is not perceived as respected by governments globally.
- The same solution can never be implemented in the same way over large areas because it will immediately raise sustainability issues.
- There is a trade-off between increased production and diversity.
- Lack of context-specific solutions and the adaptation to different local and regional contexts.
- The global food market is circulating around a narrow range of commodities due to a variety reasons (e.g. transportation barriers).
- There are lots of trade-offs within the trade.
- Problems with payments for ecosystem services. Although serious attempts have been made, it is extremely difficult to upscale in order to create a global influence. There are many small, good examples, but how we can connect local good examples to the global systemic change.

Suggestions of how to handle these challenges (based on your knowledge/experience)?

- Provide a clear definition of the new term ‘nature-positive food production’.
- Mainly focus on local-based solutions, including on the local food system production (i.e. focus on how we can feed local cities with our approaches instead of big cities globally).
- Be very specific when reaching out to local societies and be relevant to different contexts (e.g. local traditions, cultural values, environmental issues, issues with landscapes/seascapes).
- Be as inclusive as possible of different issues (e.g. human resources, social aspects, human rights aspects).
- Improve and promote farmers’ rights and labor rights. These rights are central for reaching the vision.
- Recognize and be appreciative of various knowledge.
- Create instruments (e.g. laws) that limit/ban the use of agrochemicals and the likes.
- Perhaps focus on one type of uniqueness. In Japan, for example, there are local pineapple varieties, but it is hard for the farmers to connect with the big global companies. These companies want to help if there is a unique/diversified type of crop. Another example is that big companies in pineapple production have

proposed a global diversity project within the pineapple business to further diversify and sustain local varieties. This proposal came after a local project in Suriname, which was used as an example of how upscaling can work within different crop sectors when the right actors and preconditions are in place.

- Improve international collaborations by sharing knowledge. For example, grass-fed meat does not taste the same as grain-fed meat and therefore shared knowledge is needed to create better solutions for all. Lots of research and capacity building is needed to build the right preconditions in areas that are not preferably equipped for grazing-based agriculture.
- Highlight the rights for people to access food and animals.
- Combine the local regions with scientific knowledge as different regions have different uniqueness.
- Adjust possible solutions in accordance with the situations in different areas.

How does this relate to Sweden – what is our role in this (positive and/or negative)?

- Sweden has the power to make great impact/influence globally and to change the global system to be more meaningful. Consequently, global transformation is needed.
- The roles of partnership, development, and science exchange are constantly present. This means Sweden is in a good position to influence and advocate for better policy infrastructure.

What could Sweden do to contribute to reaching the overall vision or handling these trade-offs?

- By advocating the rights to food, as citizens in many other countries do not have these rights. Sweden has the power of international diplomacy and therefore can be more righteous; the Swedish government can help other governments to be responsible for this. Sweden can further uphold the right to food as well as promote different local knowledge around the world.
- By improving local knowledge regarding the challenges and possible solutions to achieve the vision.
- By educating indigenous peoples so that they understand the local sustainable system.
- By promoting local knowledge to a greater audience.
- By largely supporting indigenous knowledge as well as human rights and cultural aspects.
- By showing examples to other countries from Sweden's own local examples (e.g. developing Sweden's own domestic food system). By acting as a role model, Sweden will have more credibility worldwide. Sweden can lead by its own examples (e.g. by enhancing local production and local knowledge).

- By re-evaluating how Swedish farmers' organizations work and finding solutions so that it will be easier to influence Sweden's global partners via global trade, for example. The main focus at a Swedish level should be biodiversity, as there is so much Sweden can do much better at home first.
- By combining local knowledge with science and implementing it in Sweden. If Sweden can manage to show examples (either from practical implementation or from science), it can boost trustworthiness levels from other countries, while at the same time Sweden will also have something to gain domestically.
- By strengthening all the actions that small organizations are already taking. This can potentially provide better solutions for sustainable trade-offs and economically sustainable issues.
- By giving a better (compressed) price at the end of the food chain to help producers. When the food price is too high, it causes problems for small organizations.
- By influencing the rights-based approach (e.g. Swedish feminist policies, gender equality). This will highlight the needed attention to the many inequalities in food production, as well as help create sustainable food systems. The main focus is that Sweden needs to push gender equality, look at this issue, and ensure other countries follow this.
- By raising capacity development, as well as building partnerships and networks globally. This includes having a deep understanding of legislation and import issues in other countries.
- By making extra efforts and incentives to move towards knowledge-intensive actions.
- By aiding farmer cooperatives (e.g. diversifying the crops, validating their processes, helping with credits, processing and marketing). For example, if one buys locally from Uganda and Kenya, how can Sweden help to empower these local producers to the global level?
- By influencing through the European Union and implementing the European Commission's Farm to Fork Strategy. This should also be applied to import countries.
- (Together with the European Union) By pressuring retailers to consider the negative aspects of selling cheap food and, through that, beginning to raise food prices.
- By providing financial support, either from states or organizations, especially to smaller producers who will be affected when demand gets higher.
- By influencing and building on policies and legislations (scaling it up) worldwide. An example of the theme could be about reducing chemical use globally. The big actors/companies/players are using too many chemicals and making much more money. The local farmers do not need to do this as they are usually already using natural products and making less money.

- By ensuring that Swedish investments and development projects are conducted in a responsible manner.
- By considering investments to diverge local contexts and culture. This will ensure the effective implementation of policies.

Other discussions

- The vision statement is very positive as it is about both contributing and protecting at the same time.
- The nature-positive food production concept is discussed and compared in relation to other relevant terms, such as agroecology and sustainable intensification.
- Nature-positive food production sounds like a positive action that encourages biodiversity, does not degrade the environment, and provides farms for families, which thereby allows people to settle down. It also offers a balance between where/how land is valued, animal rights, as well as cultural practices.
- It is the cultural farming system that helps to restore the environment.
- Though the vision statement is broad, it is not too broad. It is just a different/new umbrella term.
- Despite its barrier, the new term 'nature-positive food production' is considered a good concept to try as none of the previously used terms could cover the context of the vision statement. Previous concepts, such as 'sustainable', are highly contested, and discussions, as well as negotiations surrounding this topic, tend to be rather sensitive.
- The vision statement is not a stand-alone track; it is more of a cross-cutting one.
- Grazing-based systems need to be nature-positive.
- The importance of grazing-based agriculture, drylands, and people's right to animal-based produce should be underlined.

1.4.5 Group 6

What trade-offs or main barriers exist to reaching the overall vision?

- The vision statement is a big statement. To ensure food security means to ensure a good quantity and quality of food. Thus, we need to increase food production. A balance is possible, but we need to support the people who produce our food. It is essential to change mindsets on several levels. Only when attitudes are changed is there the possibility to achieve this vision statement. However, it is easier to say what not to do rather than to tell what to do in relation to changing mindsets on many levels.
- It is a complex vision that we are trying to reach, which means that we need more diversified food systems, and we need to consider resilience. Local communities must be involved to a greater extent than they are today, and we need to consider how they differ from region to region. We already produce a lot of food, and at the

same time there is too much food waste. We should rethink this and see if we can organize transport more efficiently to reduce food waste and support communities in need.

- It is crucial to consider knowledge; it is often taken for granted that people know certain things. Regardless of where you are, if the economy gets better, you select nicer food, which is not necessarily the best food.
- The economic issue drives the environmental issue. People have a short time span; it is all about today and quick gains (for themselves). People cannot comprehend that there is a short time to save the world, and we need to make significant changes to how we are used to living. We need to preserve rather than exploit.
- Sometimes, there are too many concepts that refer to the same thing: to restore the environment while also developing socio-economic factors. This can confuse the implementation of these actions in developing countries. We should think and talk about the world as a system and figure out where to start.

Suggestions of how to handle these challenges (based on your knowledge/experience)?

- An example from Nigeria was mentioned where there is a focus on productivity rather than sustainability. To solve this, farmers should be offered education on sustainability, and there should be a focus on raising awareness. Younger people should be empowered as well, to shift the focus from companies to them. Concerning productivity, we need to limit our food waste. What is produced is not fully utilized. By reducing the amount of food waste, we would be able to serve the needs of many populations.
- To find sustainable solutions, local populations need to be involved. What problems do they see? How do we keep good traditional knowledge at the same time as we introduce improvements? In Sweden, people often turn to cheap food, but cheap food is not necessarily a good thing compared to other factors. There is a need to change people's mindsets about food. It is a complex issue that concerns many aspects. How can we increase production, quality and create more diversified food? We should also consider what food we eat. There is food (e.g. leaves or plants) around us that we may not be aware of that we can eat, but that is natural and healthy. Camel milk, for example, has a significant impact on our bodies. Therefore we should not focus on crops and animals but rather look at what we can harvest naturally. This could also protect forest landscapes.
- There is a need to consider technology and knowledge, including indigenous knowledge. This knowledge may look different in different parts of the world. Our usual crops, such as rice, wheat, etc., should be complemented, which indigenous knowledge might help us with.
- There is a knowledge gap that needs to be closed. For example, in Africa, we can hardly see any knowledge of natural ways of sustaining landscapes. There is a

need for people capable of bringing understanding of local farmers' contribution to the food chain. Also, when processing food products, we should make sure that we get affordable nutrition. There is a need for markets where affordable products are available that ensure a limitation of food waste.

How does this relate to Sweden – what is our role in this (positive and/or negative)?

- In Sweden, we talk about two kinds of agriculture, conventional, including the use of chemicals, and organic agriculture. However, when we talk about them, we never combine them; they are usually discussed separately. We cannot take one thing from the other; it is always either-or. When changing the current food systems and transforming them for the future, we should consider combining them to make the most out of them.
- How can we make sure that what is produced can reach local communities in need at a reasonable price? This point is also relevant for the need to change mindsets and encourage system thinking. It does not help to increase production; we should make the food we are already producing more accessible. The discourse about increasing food production is double-edged. In Sweden, we often talk about the advantages of local production at the same time as wanting production to grow in order to improve exports. That is speaking with two mindsets at the same time.
- Many developing countries follow and copy what more developed countries have already done, but sometimes it is impossible to replicate the ways since they may not be relevant for all countries. Thus, we have to go first to show other ways and support development in their own ways.

What could Sweden do to contribute to reaching the overall vision or handling these trade-offs?

- We can encourage young people like Greta Thunberg to create and be engaged in movements. Youth has a greater interest in fixing what we have created and going down that road. Many things must change, and young people have both the opportunity and engagement to change them. They are not selfish in the same sense as adults, which is why we must listen to them and offer them the space to make change.
- Apart from starting the change with young people, we should work more cross-sectional and share knowledge with each other. Different stakeholders must be involved, especially local people, to get back to system thinking. Politicians and policymakers also need to be involved in order to make informed decisions. There is not much time left, so we need to move fast and collaborate extensively more than what we do today, across disciplines, regions, and all across the globe. All kinds of sciences and knowledge need to be utilized.

- In many countries, there might be the last generations of farmers who think about systems instead of monoculture or high-intensive agriculture. We should study their traditional means of living and their methods to remember these multifunctional systems and learn from them. We should support local governments and communities to preserve what is good about these systems compared to monocultures.
- A suggestion mentioned that is relevant for both Sweden and all countries having these dialogues is to promote them at the municipality level as well.

1.4.6 Group 7

What trade-offs or main barriers exist to reach the overall vision?

- The industrial thinking model in agriculture, that paradigm – to maximize production of a few products with inputs and so on.
- The incorrect belief that diversified agroecological systems cannot be practiced on a large scale to feed the world.
- The true cost of the food production is not recognized and paid – we do not pay for the effects on the environment, or the health effects that the food production has on ourselves. Staple crops are subsidized, but it would make more sense if nutritional food got that attention.
- Including small-scale farmers in the discussion and seeing things from their point of view is not adequate. For example, decisions regarding the food system summit's action tracks and agenda are mostly based on the top level/powerful actors, whereas the inputs of grass root level/farmers are less recognized.
- Land degradation of small-scale farmers. The immense pressure put on small-scale farmers to produce more, needs to be criticized.
- Lack of research – very little research is done on small-scale farmers and their production systems in comparison to research done on industrial agriculture. There is no industry behind it, so the research is not funded to the same extent.
- Less availability of information on the benefits of agroecological farming and the differences between conventional and agroecological farming.
- One thought was raised by a participant that we focus too much on trade-offs, but that it is possible to reach the goal without trade-offs. The problem is that people in power are the ones who gets to choose how to define the trade-offs. People use trade-offs as an excuse to say that something is impossible to reach, when in reality it is not.

Suggestions of how to handle these challenges (based on your knowledge/experience)?

- A paradigm shift is needed. Improving the current system will not cater for the aims of sustainable development goals.
- Need to break out of the industrial model and rethink in a broader context about the overall objectives that we are trying to achieve.
- Need a different way of thinking to identify the trade-offs and how to view them.
- Think beyond trade-offs and think in terms of synergies and win-win situations.
- The incentives need to be changed as well. If it is still profitable for people to produce the way they are, the situation will be the same in future. Carbon tax, sugar tax are all very concrete examples of how to make that change, even though it might not be easy to implement.
- Small-scale farmers' opinions could help shape the content and the outcomes of the summit (maybe a bit late now). They need to be included.
- Bridge the gap between research and small-scale farmers through new ways of sharing knowledge.
- The summit needs to address gender. Women are the main producers in small-scale agriculture, and they lack rights to land, access to safe services.
- Climate aid.
- Europe/the west should be more creative and less exclusive in their international work. Similarly, as they promote conserving food cultures, promoting localized territorial forms of food systems, involving farmers and building cooperatives within Europe, they should promote it in developing countries as well.
- We need to be less top-down and listen more to the small-scale farmers and understand their systems of production. Instead of changing their production systems we should find a mechanism to integrate modern ways into what is already in practice.
- Provide funding for research that can prove agroecology works on a large scale.
- Direct research and investment in a more diverse manner.

How does this relate to Sweden – what is our role in this (positive and/or negative)?

Also, refer to the below question. These two were answered simultaneously in the discussion.

- Certification of commodities (e.g. soy) receive more funding and research. Apparently, people have now lost interest in them.
- Sweden has invested most in Action Track 2.
- Sida is a major funding of bio-economy in Africa.
- Sweden still has unsustainable practices in our food systems, e.g. land degradation.

What could Sweden do to contribute to reaching the overall vision or handling these trade-offs?

Also, refer to the above question. These two were answered simultaneously in the discussion.

- More research can be done on how Sweden and EU's financial power and consumption could be a constructive force in a transformative approach.
- Sweden should push for diversifying the agenda; for too long it has only been led by industry importers, e.g. can avoid importing environmentally destructive products.
- Need to transform the Swedish food system, production and consumption patterns in a more sustainable manner.
- Sweden should make a clear and strong statement in the food summit by requesting a transformational change based on 13 principles of agroecology.
- Sweden needs to increase investment in development aid in the fields of non-industrial agriculture/agroecology/organic agriculture for small-scale farmers. Currently, there is less investment in research related to those fields by Sweden.
- Sida can have a strategic influence on significant resources for small-scale farmers to adopt agroecological systems using their own means, e.g. promoting farmer to farmer learning on agroecology.
- Sweden can invest more in bio-based research-oriented activities into commercialization incorporated with agroecology, which would be more constructive.
- Sweden can emphasize the agroecology policies in the countries Sweden is aiding.
- Sweden can have a clearly defined budget allocated to agroecology within the development aid programs.
- Sweden can take the global challenges related to food security into the international platforms and form global partnerships, e.g. link between food insecurity and conflicts.
- Sweden can participate in the type of discussions in the negotiations that are ongoing within the Committee on World Food Security, where the report on agroecological and other innovations is being discussed.

Other discussions

- The discussion touched very briefly upon the issue of obesity in Sweden and in the world.

1.4.7 Group 8

What trade-offs or main barriers exist to reach the overall vision?

- Lack of land rights is a barrier – if farmers don't own their own land, it's hard to control and implement sustainable land techniques. Landscape level should not be lost.
- Capacity barrier. Political agenda has been very focused on democracy and human rights – lack of knowledge on agroforestry and agriculture at the governmental level. Barrier and opportunity. More manpower into agriculture could unlock many policy solutions.
- Biodiversity is highly connected to climate change. We cannot have one without the other. Climate action is necessary to achieve this – important to spell it out though and emphasize it.
- Difficult to reach out to consumers who don't care as much, and don't know as much. How do we reach these people to increase awareness? Very hard thing to do.

Suggestions of how to handle these challenges (based on your knowledge/experience)?

- Better discussion at EU level is needed, since this is where the agricultural policy comes from in Sweden, better collaboration between NGOs and politicians. Agricultural movements are led by NGOs – governments should be more involved.
- Farm-level and landscape level can be true for Sweden, more awareness of pollination and what crops to grow, and sustainable techniques.
- Farmers should be encouraged towards nature-positive food production. They should be motivated to take up lean farming systems to judiciously use combination of organic, biological, cultural and inorganic in their production systems.
- Reviving traditional native seeds and producing foods with those seeds will pave the way for nature-positive food production
- Integrated farming systems will address nature-positive food production. It will not demand external inputs for food production; we can reduce, reuse and recycle the farm residues for raising crops and livestock.
- Extension system should be strengthened to reach every farmer to give nature-positive solutions.
- To make it into reality, farmers need to be given more capacity to understand how climate change can affect their farming systems and, in extension, food security. More emphasis should be given to how they can adapt.

How does this relate to Sweden – what is our role in this (positive and/or negative)?

- Sweden should act as a role-model in terms of agricultural techniques, show how newer techniques can work. Test them out, positive.

- Being the voice for more human rights, equity and justice is central. Market-dominance might have to be abandoned in favor of an increased focus on agroecology – Sweden can look into these questions. Be an impatient facilitator so that we can create an ambitious agenda. Be a critical and loud voice in the debate.
- Animal production is also important, where large companies are also setting the agenda in many places. Also the complexities that come with different opinions on animal production. Very different and diverse values in different parts of the world. Sweden has a lot of knowledge in these areas, with strong animal welfare acts and SLU's different research areas.

What could Sweden do to contribute to reaching the overall vision or handling these trade-offs?

- Knowledge transfer, involving universities and civil society organizations, can be an important contribution – like the AgriFoSe2030 programme.
- Development aid plays an important role. Support social movements and farmers' organizations. Supporting their agency and their participation. Need to bridge local experiences with policy.
- The aid money needs to go to organizations working with food security in this way, though, to make this happen. Political will.
- Work more on closing our own loops. If we gain knowledge on how to do this, we can share that knowledge. We can improve the balance between crop production and livestock farms, for example. Need to look at ourselves, easy to point the finger at others.
- Need to think in terms of health and well-being, there are also close links to culture and ways of life.

Other discussions

- Close the loop in the ecosystems regarding livestock; need to mention fodder, production of fodder, an important part of the food chain. More knowledge and a holistic approach are needed here.
- The agenda surrounding food production and distribution is set by corporations; however, solutions can be crowdfunded, there are positive cases. New tech. Increasing trends of food-conscious decisions – can we capitalize on that to link producers and consumers, and create more direct links between producer and buyers? There is a growing trend of this; it can also increase knowledge among both consumers and producers.
- Missing from this vision statement is the human rights aspect. How could we include equity in it, as it's missing right now? It's not only the natural world that's included in sustainability.