

REFLECTIONS ON

THE SALZBURG PROCESS ON THE CLIMATE EMERGENCY & THE FUTURE OF FOOD

Transformations for a 1.5°C World

A LEARNING PATHWAY

MAY 2020 TO MAY 2021



SALZBURG
GLOBAL
SEMINAR

GLOBAL
ALLIANCE
FOR THE
FUTURE
OF FOOD

CONTENTS

A LETTER TO PARTICIPANTS	1
INTRODUCTION	3
The Salzburg Process	3
The Ambition	4
Lessons Learned	4
NARRATIVES & THE NEED FOR A PARADIGM SHIFT	6
Cross-cutting Imperatives for Any Solution & Action	8
Tensions to Be Explored Further	9
POTENTIAL PATHWAYS FORWARD FOR FOOD SYSTEMS TRANSFORMATION	12
Overarching Criteria for Effective Action	13
Vision & Leadership	13
Inclusive Governance Processes	13
Political Opportunities	13
Levers of Change	16
Fiscal Policies	16
Trade, Regulatory, & Procurement Policies	17
Financial Reform	21
Practice Reform	23
Innovation & Research	25
Strategic Communications, Awareness-raising, & Movement-building	26
APPENDIX: ANALYSIS OF PERSPECTIVES ENGAGED	28
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	29
ENDNOTES	30

ABOUT THE GLOBAL ALLIANCE FOR THE FUTURE OF FOOD

The Global Alliance for the Future of Food is a strategic alliance of philanthropic foundations working together and with others to transform global food systems now and for future generations. We believe in the urgency of transforming global food systems, and in the power of working together and with others to effect positive change. Food systems reform requires that we craft new and better solutions at all scales through a systems-level approach and deep collaboration among philanthropy, researchers, grassroots movements, the private sector, farmers and food systems workers, Indigenous Peoples, government, and policymakers.

www.futureoffood.org

ABOUT SALZBURG GLOBAL SEMINAR

Salzburg Global Seminar is an independent non-profit organization founded in 1947 to challenge current and future leaders to shape a better world. Our multi-year programs aim to bridge divides, expand collaboration, and transform systems. We convene outstanding talent across generations, cultures, and sectors to inspire new thinking and action and to connect local innovators with global resources. Program priorities focus on Finance and Governance, Justice and Security, Planet and Health, Culture and Society, Education and Work, and Media and Voice.

www.salzburgglobal.org

DISCLAIMER

This document was written by the Global Alliance for the Future of Food and Salzburg Global Seminar for use by Global Alliance members and partners and Salzburg Global Seminar Fellows to stimulate discussion about critical issues related to food systems transformation, climate change, and to help guide collective action. Any views expressed in this document do not necessarily represent the views of the Global Alliance and any of its members, nor of Salzburg Global Seminar.

Copyright © 2021 Global Alliance for the Future of Food and Salzburg Global Seminar. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution–NonCommercial 4.0 International License.

Suggestion for Referencing: Global Alliance for the Future of Food and Salzburg Global Seminar. *Reflections on The Salzburg Process on the Climate Emergency & the Future of Food: Transformation for a 1.5°C World*. n.p.: Global Alliance for the Future of Food and Salzburg Global Seminar, May 2021.

A LETTER TO PARTICIPANTS

It is one year since we gathered virtually for the series of events that made up the **Salzburg Process on the Climate Emergency & the Future of Food**. This online initiative was our attempt to facilitate an international dialogue at long distance as the COVID-19 pandemic raged across the world, throwing the everyday into disarray and compounding the worst of the deep structural inequities across all societies.

The Salzburg Process tested our capacity to innovate and to deliver the strategic convening and collective intelligence that define our organizations' missions. Like so many, we had to adapt fast and embrace new methodologies and collaborative technologies. Of our peers, we now know that we were some of the first to host an online gathering of this scale. We are happy that our experience and shared learning helped pave the way for other changemakers.

The Salzburg Process had one overarching objective: to connect communities at the nexus of food systems and climate change. All too often, mainstream analysis has ignored the deep interconnections that exist between human, animal, and ecological health and well-being. The low power and visibility of those most affected, coupled with a misplaced hope for "silver bullet" solutions, has held back the development of more integrated and inclusive pathways to change. Yet COVID-19 has confirmed that far-reaching systemic action, with equity and justice at its centre, is essential to create a resilient, sustainable future for the many, not just the few.

The Salzburg Process aimed to co-create a safe space for openness. A space where ideas, issues, tensions, convergences, and divergences related to food systems and climate change could be explored and discussed on equal terms. We recognized this was an ambitious task but hoped the process and confluence of diverse perspectives would help surface potential opportunities for collective action.



The Salzburg Process aimed to co-create a safe space for openness. A space where ideas, issues, tensions, convergences, and divergences related to food systems and climate change could be explored and discussed on equal terms.

Transformational change challenges the status quo and deep-rooted behaviours, practices, and societal norms. It is dynamic, it takes time, and it takes trust. It is neither straightforward nor linear, and so neither can be our plans and processes. As you will read in the following pages, we listened intently and humbly during and after the Salzburg Process, shifting our final objectives to better reflect the realities of bridging divides online during a pandemic.

This Reflection and Learning Pathway is a synthesis of the Process, the discussions, the feedback, and our takeaways as the convenors. It shines a light on stones unturned, and we hope, in doing so, creates opportunities for further exploration and dialogue. We invite readers to use and amplify the content in line with their own missions, resources, and capacity.

While the Salzburg Process and the Future of Food did not result in the Shared Action Framework we intended, it generated real benefits: deep conversations, the Global Alliance's [Seven Calls to Action](#), and an expanded community of individuals and organizations committed to the intersectional climate and food agendas. Speaking personally, the Salzburg Process has deeply informed the way our respective organizations approach these issues. We are deeply appreciative to everyone who took part and created these opportunities for growth and learning.

RUTH RICHARDSON

Executive Director,
Global Alliance for the Future of Food

CLARE SHINE

Former Vice President & Chief Program Officer,
Salzburg Global Seminar (now Director & CEO,
Cambridge Institute for Sustainability Leadership)

MAY 2021

INTRODUCTION

Food and agriculture systems contribute to and are significantly impacted by climate change, but, crucially, they are also an integral part of the solutions we urgently need. To keep global warming below 1.5°C by 2050 — while halting biodiversity loss; reducing inequalities; and upholding ecological resilience, health, and well-being, as well as transparent, inclusive, and participatory governance processes — concerted action is required to transform key sectors, systems, and financial flows worldwide.

THE SALZBURG PROCESS

Bringing together more than 300 diverse changemakers, experts, and leaders from local to global levels, the *Salzburg Process on the Climate Emergency & the Future of Food* was an international dialogue, co-hosted by the Global Alliance for the Future of Food and Salzburg Global Seminar, dedicated to accelerating the actions, investments, and policies needed for healthy, equitable, resilient, and diverse food systems. Mixing thought-provoking presentations and curated conversations with knowledge exchange and informal interactions, the cross-cutting objective of this dialogue was to connect individuals and networks and, where possible, to build strategic alignment on key areas for transformation at the nexus of climate and food.



Mixing thought-provoking presentations and curated conversations with knowledge exchange and informal interactions, the cross-cutting objective of this dialogue was to connect individuals and networks and to, where possible, build strategic alignment on key areas for transformation at the nexus of climate and food.

Originally planned to be an in-person conference spread out over a week, the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic meant we had to pivot to a virtual series of events. The agenda was organized around five hot topics and four levers of change.

Building on the outcomes of a 2019 event during Climate Week in New York and informed by discussions with an external advisory committee established to support the delivery of this convening, the five hot topics rising to the fore of the food–climate nexus at the time were: 1) nature-based solutions, 2) livestock production, 3) sustainable and healthy diets, 4) food loss and waste, and 5) just transitions. Each of the hot topic areas represent a critical link where the food and climate agendas come together. The four cross-cutting, interlinked levers of change were: 1) policy reform, 2) financial reform, 3) practice reform, and 4) public narratives and strategic political communications.

Together, the Global Alliance and Salzburg Global Seminar commissioned five discussion papers from external authors to help set the scene in advance of the conference as well as guide the discussions. These papers (which can be found [here](#)) presented a snapshot of the current issues and raised potential opportunities and challenges for action.

THE AMBITION: CO-CREATION OF A SHARED ACTION FRAMEWORK

One ambition of the process was to catalyze the co-creation of a Shared Action Framework, underpinned by a shared narrative, that identified top priorities and opportunities for systems transformation across sectors, scales, and processes. It was meant to be a high-level guide for diverse stakeholders to take a holistic, collaborative approach to transform food systems, moving the content forward in ways that were appropriate to their mission, resources, and capacity. We recognized and communicated from the outset that implementation pathways would, as they always do, vary by country, sector, and organization, and that some participants would align with the proposed actions while others would not. Moreover, the actions were not meant to be all-encompassing but rather to represent opportunities for reform, intervention, or further exploration.

A draft document based on the notes from the Salzburg Process was shared with all participants for feedback in July 2020. We received nearly 80 responses, with much positive feedback. Some respondents made suggestions to the wording of the narrative, key messages, and specific recommendations, while others offered proposals for next steps. Feedback on the need for further clarity on the intended purpose, the target audience, and ways to implement the actions was also shared. In the sections that follow, we provide a draft narrative, reflections on the cross-cutting imperatives for systems transformation, a list of areas of tension that we heard need more exploration and dialogue, and a non-exhaustive list of actions suggested.

Given the tensions on certain issues, as well as the challenges of working through those tensions with time and care during a pandemic, the Global Alliance and Salzburg Global Seminar have reframed and restructured the materials and feedback into this document. Both organizations are committed to deep listening and learning. In this spirit, rather than presenting a Shared Action Framework, we are sharing simple but important lessons learned, as well as a few reflections on the imperatives required to advance what is one of the most critical, urgent, and contentious issues of our time.

LESSONS LEARNED

We learned a number of lessons from this process:

- 1) Diverse, inclusive participation requires an intentional, high-touch approach.** Ensuring the participation of those often marginalized (including civil society, and representatives from the Global South) requires deliberate processes and support mechanisms to facilitate engagement. For example, convenors must be intentional about providing support to access/upgrade internet capabilities, travel (where possible), and for translation, as well as consideration of time zones, etc.

- 2) **Power dynamics are real and must be addressed.** Power dynamics must be acknowledged, attended to, and mitigated meaningfully, otherwise the process itself comes into question. The nature of multi-stakeholder processes means that tensions are unavoidable; what is paramount is that these processes aim to be inclusive, transparent, and accountable. For example, feedback mechanisms must be open and visible to all participants.
- 3) **Building trust takes time, investment, and space.** Transformational change challenges deep structural and social norms. It involves bringing together diverse communities to engage in hard conversations and to build trust over contentious issues. There are severe limitations to building trust through online formats and compressed time frames. For example, the power of hallway conversations and social interactions over meals to connect people and provide a space to dig into tough issues cannot be underestimated.
- 4) **Digital platforms can be either key accelerators or stumbling blocks.** Technology platforms have radically improved international information sharing and connection-making during the pandemic. But, by design, they lack the intimacy of in-person events where people can connect one-to-one in formal and informal ways; they require significant human and financial resources to set up well; and the reliance on technology creates access issues that must be anticipated. While some platforms have proven essential during COVID-19, other platforms' utility and people's capacity to engage must be scrutinized carefully. For example, Hivebrite — the platform of choice for the Salzburg Process — required significant resources to set up and manage, and it was not sustainable over time.

Additional lessons learned from planning a virtual event can be found in this [Medium blog](#).

NARRATIVES & THE NEED FOR A PARADIGM SHIFT

To transform today's systems and respond to the climate emergency, the prevailing narratives and mindsets that influence research, investment, policy priorities, and practices across food systems must be challenged and countered. The inequitable impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic and climate change reflect deep, cross-cutting dysfunctions at the heart of the industrialized food system. Moreover, the climate emergency exacerbates the failures and inequalities in today's food systems; they are inextricably linked. In this section, you will find a draft narrative prepared by the co-hosts in the months after the Salzburg Process. The content draws on discussions held in the groups and has been shaped by the participants who provided feedback.

There are many different kinds of food systems: some function well while contributing to a healthier, sustainable, equitable, inclusive, and resilient vision; others, especially those based on the commodification of food and nature, are locked into an industrial system¹ that too often results in poor health for people and the planet. It is the latter that dominates the global narrative. Thus, it is time for a paradigm shift.

FROM

food systems dominated by a focus on yields and calories, reliant on chemical-intensive agriculture, concentrated livestock production, ultra-processed foods,² deregulated and consolidated global supply chains that exploit the workforce, and extractive land and water practices that undermine ecosystem health, basic human rights, and cultural traditions

TO

food systems that are focused on multiple benefits including health, resilience, diversity, equity, inclusion, renewability, and interconnection; that function as a sink for greenhouse gases while minimizing emissions; that are centred on human rights and sustainable food production practices; that enhance ecosystem health, support community resilience and livelihoods, ensure nutritious, accessible, and culturally respectful diets, build biodiversity, and protect food sovereignty

To achieve this paradigm shift, dominant assumptions must be challenged. The content for this came from the Salzburg Process; the inspiration for this format was informed by the Global Alliance's work (2018 to 2020) to collaboratively shape and inform a narrative about the food–health nexus (available [here](#)). It is imperative that, globally, society needs to move:

From a primary focus on the quantity of food produced and sold (i.e., yield and productivity)

From gross domestic product as the primary metric for development and CO₂ emissions as the primary metric for planetary health

From a focus on efficiency as a primary end goal

From a primary focus on problems and “end-of-pipe” solutions (i.e., behavioural shifts, livestock emissions reduction, agricultural efficiency, waste reuse and recycling)

From decision-making dominated by a few large, influential stakeholders

From profit-driven approaches to food production and distribution that have limited the ability to respect basic human rights, the right to food, cultural traditions, and ecosystem services

From an expectation for single-focus solutions and interventions

From a focus on top-down technological solutions

From a focus on nature-based solutions built on conservation and biodiversity in the absence of human interaction

To a primary focus on the quality of food in delivering human, animal, and ecological health and resilience as a public good

To a set of comprehensive and holistic metrics that take into account social, human, ecological externalities, both positive and negative

To sustaining cultures and communities and nourishing ourselves in a way that is healthy and respects our planetary boundaries

To also addressing the root causes (i.e., commodification of food and nature, land tenure and access to productive resources, privatization of public lands, food environments, value chain transparency and accountability, growing corporate consolidation, power asymmetries in governance structures)

To inclusive, participatory governance processes and transparent deliberation

To safeguarding dignity and human rights, ecosystem services, cultural traditions and traditional knowledge, and the rights to access land, seeds, and resources as a foundation for food sovereignty and human health

To a celebration and expansion of a diversity of context-appropriate and holistic solutions

To cultivating the co-creation of agroecological and regenerative technological solutions in partnership with local food producers and other food systems actors

To re-balancing human activity within the natural world and planetary boundaries

CROSS-CUTTING IMPERATIVES FOR ANY SOLUTION & ACTION

Throughout the dialogue, participants in the Salzburg Process stressed that the COVID-19 recovery process and urgent responses to the climate emergency can — and should — reset the way we nourish ourselves, uphold equity and human rights, and ensure ecological resilience. Crucially, it was stressed that the nature of the transition is just as important as the outcome.

The following three cross-cutting imperatives for shaping action, determining the pathways, and implementing the solutions came to the fore from the process and the feedback.

EQUITY & POWER

Inequalities and power imbalances will continue to create dysfunctional social and ecological environments. Current practice enables ineffective policies and policymaking, where voices of the vulnerable and those with low visibility and who lack access to democratic participation are not heard. Moreover, the deep interconnections between humans, animals, nature, and the planet alike are obscured or, worse, undermined. Many recognize the very unequal power relations and spheres of influence in agri-food systems. The impacts of power inequality is felt globally but most acutely by communities in the Global South and by marginalized communities in the Global North. It is often marginalized people who have local and traditional knowledge to adapt and build resilience in increasingly volatile, unpredictable, and complex environments. The best-laid plans for urgent mitigation, adaptation, and change will not succeed until we address the underlying power imbalances and other factors contributing to vulnerability, including structural inequality, racism, and oppression in governance and institutions.

GOVERNANCE & REPRESENTATION

Vested interests in the status quo of extractive food systems prevent our governance systems and institutions from upholding solidarity, equal agency, and just representation. Decision-making processes must be transparent, inclusive, and participatory, include the perspectives of all systems actors and actively address the power imbalances between different actors in a process. Power asymmetries mean some who hold important solutions face barriers to participation and are not heard. Diverse voices provide vital insights, knowledge, and practical information for real systems-level interventions; solutions must be co-created with those communities most vulnerable to climate change impacts.

ECONOMICS & MEASURING WHAT MATTERS

We have relied for too long on single-focus metrics that prioritize economic productivity, which in turn allow and enable our systems of production and consumption to go beyond planetary limits. The value of food systems goes well beyond economic value and the narrow figures and statistics that inform conventional measures of success. Sustainable, healthy, and resilient food systems provide ecosystem services, which are insufficiently internalized in conventional economic accounting. Food is not an economic

commodity; it is a public good at the heart of our societies, cultural identities, and lives. Healthy food systems are a key determinant of healthy populations. It is time to counter the prevailing economic frameworks and decision-making approaches that keep systems locked into reproducing poor cycles of health for people and the planet alike.

TENSIONS TO BE EXPLORED FURTHER

While many readers may be able to relate to and even support the need for a shift in narrative and the opportunity for collective action (as outlined in the previous sections), the Salzburg Process shone a light on the divergences in *how* such transformations take place, by whom, and when. This was a salient outcome of the work and demonstrates the complexity of the transformation process. It also points to the necessity of, and opportunity for, further engagement and discussion of critical issues.

In this section, we highlight a number of the tensions that surfaced both during and after the Salzburg Process discussions:

1. Framing the UN Food Systems Summit (UNFSS) as an important political opportunity

Throughout the Salzburg Process, a number of participants expressed concern that naming the UNFSS as a near-term political opportunity could indicate endorsement of the Summit by participants in the Salzburg Process. While many individuals and organizations are participating in the UNFSS process, others are critical of the preparation, organization, and objectives of the Summit, as can be found in this [collective letter](#) to the UN Secretary General.

2. Using the term “net zero” emissions

During the dialogue, the term “net zero” was identified as problematic. Participants discussed how some emissions are more difficult to abate than others (e.g., industrial and transport emissions) and that negative emissions (i.e., carbon sinks) are needed to balance out emissions from the “hard-to-abate” sectors. Concerns were expressed that the term has been co-opted, and that it is being marshalled to encourage investment in “carbon offset” projects and untested (at scale) [negative emissions technologies](#), such as [bioenergy with carbon capture and storage](#), amongst other issues.

3. Referring to the terms “nature-based solutions” & “natural climate solutions”

Similarly, concerns were raised about the use of the terms “nature-based solutions” (in the event agenda and materials) and “natural climate solutions,” which refer to carbon offset projects that claim to protect, transform, or restore land, thereby serving as a carbon sink. Non-governmental organization advocates for [natural climate solutions](#) support efforts to maximize greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) reduction from the energy sector as well as maximize the absorptive capacity of natural sinks from better land stewardship. However, the concern was that the

term is also championed by fossil fuel companies, which use carbon offsets to compensate business-as-usual production practices and who remain the main contributor to global GHG emissions.

4. **Opposing ecosystem services markets & land-based carbon offsets**

The concept of “ecosystem services markets” is based on carbon markets and emissions trading, which were developed in response to the Kyoto Protocol as an economically efficient method to reduce global GHG emissions. Raised throughout the Salzburg Process, a cross-section of environmental groups, farmers, farm-workers, and environmental justice and other groups have expressed their opposition to these markets. Participants were also broadly concerned that the more measurable and quantifiable aspects of nature will be brought into the market, leading to the financialization of nature instead of holistically valuing the ecological integrity of natural systems.

Some Salzburg Process participants also expressed concern that, as the protection or conservation of “ecosystem services” become an opportunity for profit, there can be unanticipated negative effects on local communities including “green grabbing” of land, forests, and/or other resources by external investors who aim to profit from the sale of ecosystem services. These concerns are based on experiences in small-scale fishing communities, land-use conflicts in politically unstable countries, and REDD/REDD+ projects to reduce deforestation and forest degradation. Participants also shared research documenting that such projects are not delivering the emissions reductions promised. Even though the recommendations call for transparent metrics and strong safeguards, not all communities believe that it is possible to develop, let alone enforce, standards that would be strong enough to compensate for the risk of producing a set of new and often poorly understood commodities in the form of ecosystem services. Therefore, some believe that the focus should be on shifting public investment toward ecosystem services rather than relying on private sector market mechanisms.

5. **Highlighting the role of trade in delivering food security & principles of food sovereignty**

As part of the lever of change discussions, the role of trade and food security, and the impact of free trade ideology on food sovereignty, was flagged by Salzburg participants. Concerns were raised that many of the provisions in free trade agreements and bilateral investment treaties can be detrimental to small producers by undermining farmers’ rights, i.e., the right to save, use, exchange, and sell farm-saved seeds and propagating materials, while giving preference to the needs and requirements of big business and industrial corporations.

6. **Framing food security & food safety**

A cross-cutting issue raised by many Salzburg participants was that food security

and food safety, and the potential to link ecological health, animal health, and human health, are currently underappreciated in the climate discourse even though these are key political drivers in many Global South countries.

7. Framing “less and better” & addressing emissions from livestock production

Through the hot topic “Livestock Production” sessions, the framing of “less and better” meat consumption was identified as a tension with the perception that this term is a Global North construct. It was emphasized that with respect to action on climate change and biodiversity loss, the concept is context specific. Participants noted growing research demonstrating that the consumption of much less animal protein is healthier for all populations and demographics as long as a culturally appropriate, diverse, and balanced whole-foods diet is accessible. It was also recognized that many people in the Global South do not have access to enough protein to meet nutritional needs.

8. Focusing on land reform as key to just transitions in agriculture

Through the hot topic “Just Transitions” sessions, land reform as a critical human rights issue — championed by food sovereignty movements, Indigenous Peoples, and environmental justice groups — was raised by participants as a way to unlock a number of other actions and approaches. The direct challenge of land reform to current power asymmetries, privatization of public lands, corporate consolidation, land and water grabbing, and displacement and dispossession of communities from their land was also emphasized by participants.

POTENTIAL PATHWAYS FORWARD FOR FOOD SYSTEMS TRANSFORMATION

What pathways forward were proposed through the Salzburg Process?

In this section, we collate and summarize the actions related to food systems and climate that were presented in the discussion papers commissioned as pre-event inputs (available [here](#)), circulated to participants, and debated during the Salzburg Process, as well as those actions suggested and/or clarified subsequently as part of the feedback process. The actions identified through the Salzburg Process are grouped into overarching criteria, political opportunities, and levers of change and are listed in no particular order.

This non-exhaustive list includes actions that have been flagged as tensions in the previous section. Thus, we share these items simply as an output — a codification — of the Salzburg Process, acknowledging the lack of consensus and some of the legitimate questions and concerns raised during the process itself. Myriad opportunities exist both to further explore the tensions, potential pathways, and solutions inherent in food systems transformation and action on climate change as well as to inform and shape the work of actors and related processes.

For example, in October 2020, the Global Alliance concluded a systematic and thorough review of 8 years of work to produce [Seven draft Calls to Action](#) for food systems transformation. The Global Alliance reviewed documented outcomes from all Global Alliance events and international dialogues held since 2012, including the Salzburg Process, alongside its entire catalogue of reports. Similarly, Salzburg Global Seminar has increasingly woven the issue of food systems transformation into programs across its interdisciplinary portfolio and will continue to raise the issue in agendas on finance, urban development, health, and beyond.

The Salzburg Process amplified key insights about how food systems transformation requires: a recognition of different practices, terminologies, and their histories; deep collaboration and engagement amongst all people (farmers, fishers, pastoralists, Indigenous Peoples, youth, women, civil society organizations, research institutions, governments, philanthropy, the private sector, investors, employers, social entrepreneurs, trade unions, workers, citizens); contextual understanding and the specifics of different contexts; diverse sources of evidence; and different types of investment, at different scales.



Myriad opportunities exist both to further explore the tensions, potential pathways, and solutions inherent in food systems transformation and action on climate change as well as to inform and shape the work of actors and related processes.

OVERARCHING CRITERIA FOR EFFECTIVE ACTION

VISION & LEADERSHIP

We heard throughout the Salzburg Process that a requisite underpinning of any effective pathway is leadership and vision.

1. Participants emphasized that effective food systems leaders need to be supported at all levels (i.e., international, national, regional, local, community-based) and across sectors (e.g., private sector, public sector, farmers and producers of all scales, Indigenous Peoples, workers, civil society) to provide inspiration and motivation amongst their constituencies and/or communities.
2. The need for ambitious, context-appropriate food systems visions, based on a set of principles inclusively co-developed with all impacted actors, and supported by clear implementation pathways was discussed by participants. To support these visions, strategies and policies should include both interim targets for phasing out harmful practices (such as the reliance on chemical inputs, antibiotic use, deforestation, and other activities contributing to climate change, biodiversity loss, and poor ecological and human health and well-being) as well as for nurturing enabling environments for change.

INCLUSIVE GOVERNANCE PROCESSES

We also heard through the Salzburg discussions that a requisite for any effective pathway is an inclusive, integrated, multilevel governance process with support given to traditionally underrepresented groups to engage on an equal footing. Indeed, in order to enable a “Just Transition,”³ participants emphasized the need for a concerted effort to correct imbalances of power and enable meaningful, democratic participation from diverse levels of government, sectors, demographics, and actors, especially independent trade unions and underrepresented voices (women, smallholder farmers, Indigenous Peoples, youth, and poor and marginalized groups).

Throughout the discussions, it was noted that policymaking outcomes often reflect the interests of those with access, power, and wealth. Outcomes that deliver real progress require participatory planning and implementation frameworks, which embed continuous evaluation and adaptation, as well as strong local institutions. Several recommendations surfaced:

1. **Strengthen national government accountability for inclusive, accountable, and transparent governance processes** so that the voices of vulnerable groups, youth, women, Indigenous Peoples, persons with disabilities, and local communities are adequately represented and integrated in policy discussions on climate, biodiversity, health, and livelihoods, nationally and in global fora (i.e., UNFCCC COPs, CFS, Convention on Biological Diversity COPs, the UN Sustainable Development Goals, the UN Decade for Ecosystem Restoration 2021-2030, the UN Decade for

Action on Nutrition 2016-2025, the UN Decade for Ecosystem Restoration 2021–2030, the UNFSS 2021, International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture, International Union for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants).

2. **Promote and develop systems-focused multi-stakeholder platforms** to shape and drive systemic approaches, ensure wide and diverse representation of actors who influence the system, enable shared learning and scaling of solutions, and support coherence amongst the levers for change.
3. **Support regional initiatives to help bridge the urban–rural divide** by engaging farmers, workers, and consumers as well as cities and municipalities. The latter were identified as key entry points for building citizen support and for championing innovation and inclusive governance that engages citizens and communities.
4. **Promote integrated food systems governance at local, regional, national, and international levels.** Governments should coordinate and collaborate across agriculture, climate, environment, natural resources, health, development, trade, economy, finance, and culture on the rules and incentives that govern how food is produced, processed, distributed, and retailed in order to create more sustainable, healthy, resilient, and equitable food systems.

POLITICAL OPPORTUNITIES

Participants identified the following critical political opportunities that should be seized by climate and food systems advocates to advance food systems transformation.

1. **Advocate for agroecology and regenerative and resilient food, land, and aquatic system approaches in the Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) and National Adaptation Plans.** Signatories of the Paris Climate Agreement must publish NDCs in 2020 and every 5 years thereafter. A minority of plans submitted to date include progressive aspects related to food systems.
 - 1.1 Support, engage, and influence relevant international and national policy actors in countries to better understand the climate mitigation, adaptation, and resilience benefits of supporting agroecological and regenerative approaches,⁴ minimizing food loss and waste, restoring degraded land and improving soil health, supporting sustainable fisheries and aquatic systems, supporting more localized, resilient food systems, transforming local food environments, supporting dietary shifts to diverse, nutrient-dense whole-food diets (including a reduction in animal protein and highly processed food consumption in overconsuming societies), and avoiding a so-called “nutrition transition.”
 - 1.2 Analyze, expose, and debunk false solutions and incentives that perpetuate the prevailing food systems paradigm or, worse, further drive us toward ecosystem destruction while exacerbating social inequalities. New technologies can be an opportunity to improve livelihoods and efficiency but can also be seen as a threat if not managed to account for usage, control, scale-appropriateness, cost, and access. They are not a replacement for addressing the root causes of unhealthy, unsustainable, and high GHG-emitting food systems.

1.3 Uphold human rights principles set out in the [Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forest in the Context of National Food Security \(VGGT\)](#), the [UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples](#), and the [UN Declaration on the Rights of Peasants and Other People Working in Rural Areas \(UNDROP\)](#) in national plans.

2. Direct COVID-19 economic recovery funds toward food systems actors that prioritize human, ecological, and animal health and resilience, while advancing practices that minimize GHG emissions and other environmental impacts and maximize the absorptive capacity and biodiversity of the natural environment. Government recovery and economic stimulus responses to COVID-19 over the coming months represent a unique and time-sensitive opportunity to reset how food systems actors in food harvesting, production, processing, distribution, and retailing, etc., are funded and supported by national governments and public institutions.

2.1 Support a recovery designed around sustainability, health, equity, and resilience, as well as GHG impact, at the heart of measures to respond to the pandemic. This calls for recovery measures (finance relief, subsidies, regulations) to be directed toward practices that reflect and enable the paradigm shift, including ensuring access to diets that are good for people and the planet; restoring degraded lands and improving soil health; applying agroecological and regenerative approaches; reducing food loss and waste; and ensuring fair payment and worker safety and well-being.

2.2 Support measures that address food safety and food security while maintaining or encouraging a shift to nutritious, diverse, whole-foods diet.

3. Call for country leaders at UN Summits to commit to transforming food systems as a priority for achieving the Paris Agreement objectives. In September 2021, the UNFSS will make the transformation of food systems a global political priority for the first time. The UN Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) 15th Conference of Parties in October will adopt a post-2020 global biodiversity framework for this decade. The UN Framework Convention on Climate Change 26th Conference of Parties (COP26) in November 2021 aims to accelerate action toward the goals of the Paris Agreement and includes a focus on forest-risk commodities, agricultural subsidy reform, and financial flows that support nature-based solutions to climate change and biodiversity loss. The Nutrition for Growth (N4G) Summit in December 2021 aims to generate action policy and financing commitments to SDG2 (ending hunger in all its forms) and will focus on the critical roles of food, health, and social protection systems. The preparation for these significant political moments in 2021 represents a critical opportunity for the food and climate communities to align around common messages and bold asks to political leaders on the need for a systems approach to simultaneously address the climate emergency, justice and equity, nutrition, health and well-being, and planetary boundaries.

- 3.1 Consult with a diversity of stakeholders, especially civil society actors and small-scale producers, to develop their commitments and uphold human rights principles set out in UN declarations.
- 3.2 Strengthen participation by civil society, farmers, Indigenous Peoples, fishers, pastoralists, and other underrepresented stakeholders in UN and other international and regional processes influencing the food, agriculture, land-use and climate policies (e.g., World Committee on Food Security [CFS], African Union Summit, annual meetings of multilateral development banks).
- 3.3 Support alignment and mutual reinforcement of UN treaties on climate, biodiversity, desertification, oceans, and human rights.

LEVERS OF CHANGE

Through the Salzburg Process, including the [discussion papers](#) that were prepared as key inputs, a number of levers for change were identified, debated, and refined. We collate and summarize these actions as a way to document and reflect upon these important deliberations.

FISCAL POLICIES

1. Reform food, agricultural, and fisheries subsidies and other fiscal incentives.

- 1.1 Convert harmful subsidies and perverse incentives for large-scale, concentrated livestock systems and unsustainable intensive monoculture production — both of which are dependent on external chemical inputs and stimulate overproduction, price distortion, and devaluation of food — to subsidies and incentives that support and de-risk: i) agroecological, regenerative agricultural, and circular economy practices, and ii) sustainable, diverse, healthy, nutritious, and affordable diets as a public good.⁵ Compensate farmers that generate multiple positive externalities (e.g., diversity, resilience, human and animal health, GHG, water, biodiversity).
- 1.2 Change the incentive structure to reduce food loss and waste through zero-waste policies, such as creating markets for recycling nutrient-rich waste back into productive use, providing tax deductions for donating nutritious, good-quality food, and providing rebates and other incentives for the adoption of waste prevention technologies.
- 1.3 Reform biofuel mandates and incentives to prevent the burning of food for fuel.
- 1.4 Tax ultra-processed foods (e.g., soda, sugary products, junk food) and leverage other fiscal policies aimed at reducing the social and health costs of poor diets. Use the revenues for social aims, such as making sustainable, healthy, and nutrient-dense whole foods more widely available and affordable to vulnerable and low-income communities.
- 1.5 Explore the use of pricing policies to internalize the positive and negative externalities of different food production and consumption practices.

2. Support just transitions to low-carbon, climate-resilient food systems by directing public support to ensure the livelihoods and prosperity of small- and

medium-size farms and fisheries; farmers in transition; small, medium, and micro enterprises (SMMEs); workers; and vulnerable communities via:

- 2.1 Infrastructure, agricultural extension services, and other technical assistance.
 - 2.2 Investments, loans, and incentives, especially for smallholder farmers and SMMEs, to build capacity on regenerative/agroecological production practices and food loss and waste reduction.
 - 2.3 Training and employment guarantee schemes for workers, including informal workers (e.g., migrant and seasonal labourers), to transition to green jobs and resilient livelihoods.
 - 2.4 Social protection programs to facilitate the affordability of healthy and sustainable diets for poor and vulnerable households (e.g., through vouchers, cash, school feeding, and food supplement programs) and the provision of public healthcare services for all but especially for poor and vulnerable communities. In particular, tailored support is needed for women, youth, and Indigenous Peoples.
- 3. Ensure sufficient financial resources for government initiatives focused on facilitating large-scale industry transition to sustainable, high-welfare livestock production and sustainable protein alternatives, especially in high-producing areas.** For example, the [Global Plan of Action for Animal Genetic Resources](#) aims to increase livestock sustainability by focusing less on conversion efficiencies and more broadly on attributes such as disease resistance and adaptability to local climatic conditions. Engage and support traditional and sustainable pastoralism where applicable.

TRADE, REGULATORY, & PROCUREMENT POLICIES

- 1. Reform bilateral and regional trade and investment policies to support food systems resilience and protect the livelihoods and human rights of all food systems actors.** Global trade policies that currently aim to accelerate market access, reduce regulatory barriers to trade, promote export-oriented commodity crops, and result in greater reliance on imports are often at the expense of public goods, such as healthy and resilient ecosystems and communities. Outcomes should prioritize food systems and agricultural resilience, ecosystem restoration, access to sustainable and healthy foods and diets, secure land and resource tenure for vulnerable groups, and the protection of livelihoods and cultural traditions, alongside productivity.
- 1.1 Reform international and national trade and investment policies, international development assistance, national procurement policies, and national economic policies in consultation with civil society. Current policies, which often incentivize the overproduction of commodity crops, should also support local food systems resilience and food sovereignty through the development of territorial/regional markets that are accessible by small- and medium-scale food producers. Territorial/regional markets forge more direct links between producers and consumers, reduce emissions associated with long-distance supply chains, and foster local food security.

- 1.2 Support greater access and equitable conditions for women smallholder farmers in global supply chains. Women represent the majority of smallholder farmers, and creating livelihood security for smallholders means more capacity to invest in regenerative methods.
- 1.3 Discourage or halt the export/import of restricted or banned chemicals and deforestation-related food.
- 1.4 Include in the World Trade Organization reform agenda an impact assessment of trade rules on climate, biodiversity loss, planetary and human health, and food security and due diligence of global supply chains.

2. Strengthen collective and community rights to land via land reforms by national and subnational governments in close collaboration with local stakeholders.

- 2.1 Reform land tenure systems and governance to ensure the rights of food workers, farmers, and producers, Indigenous communities and their access to their territories and resources, including seeds, waters, ecosystems, biodiversity, and healthy food systems.
- 2.2 Enact land-use planning and policies that favours use of arable land for human food production (i.e., rather than for biofuel production), while devoting non-arable land to sustainable and resilient pastoral/agropastoral practices, agroforestry, and other practices that support ecosystem restoration.
- 2.3 Enact and enforce policies that prevent conversion of ecologically sensitive habitats for livestock and cropland production, while supporting the reintegration of livestock onto degraded land or into arable rotation (i.e., silvopastoral cattle farming).
- 2.4 Enact policies to support pastoralists and other traditional livestock producers, facilitating market access and recognizing land access rights to preserve well-adapted production systems in the face of increasing climate crisis stresses.
- 2.5 Address concentration and consolidation of land and resources and land speculation through antitrust legislation, regulations on long-term rental of state land, and other policies, as well as through supporting local entrepreneurship, innovation, and diversity across the value chain.
- 2.6 Develop and implement robust human rights grievance mechanisms and other appropriate regulation to reduce the risk that local communities lose access to, or control of, land or associated resources through large-scale land acquisitions, and to ensure that they have access to justice and remedy in case such issues occur.

3. Reform governance of ocean space to facilitate access to inland, coastal, and ocean fisheries and associated resources by small-scale fishers and their communities. Small-scale traditional fishers provide valuable and affordable protein for local communities and face challenges accessing ocean resources. Current governance structures often prioritize large-scale and environmentally damaging deep-sea fishing, tourism, oil and gas extraction, and other competing uses of ocean space. As many fish stocks are in critical and rapid decline, and as fish is

a very important source of protein globally, adjusting policies and governance of ocean space to take into account the needs of small-scale fishers practicing sustainable and agroecological techniques is a critical contributor to sustainable and healthy food systems.

4. Provide equal access and fair conditions for all food systems actors via regulatory reform, accompanied by monitoring and accountability measures.

Share economic value more fairly with the actors across the supply chain.

- 4.1 Provide better terms of trade and greater risk-sharing protections for smallholder farmers and farmers with agroecological and regenerative agricultural practices, and put in place and/or enforce antitrust legislation related to mergers and acquisitions, price-fixing, restraint of trade, and market monopolization, to name a few.
- 4.2 Reform food reserve procurement, price stabilization/support measures, seed ownership, and other supply-management policies to promote agroecological and regenerative agricultural production practices, reduce rural poverty, and improve rural food and nutrition security (especially amongst smallholder farmers), and increase food sovereignty.
- 4.3 Adopt stronger and more uniform labour regulation and improve labour conditions via contracts reform and other governing measures. Allow full protection of rights of free association and assembly.
- 4.4 Adopt social, food, and worker safety and environmental standards with mandatory corporate compliance.

5. Adopt, strengthen, and enforce environmental and health regulations governing food production.

- 5.1 Regulate and enforce pollution related to air, soil, and water (e.g., from phosphates, nitrates, ammonia emissions, and nitrous oxide emissions) as well as hazardous wastes (e.g., pesticides).
- 5.2 Establish better accounting systems for N₂O and methane from agricultural systems.
- 5.3 Regulate and enforce animal health and welfare standards (i.e., minimizing antimicrobial use to reduce antimicrobial resistance by, for example, applying good fish and animal farming practices and improving animal welfare).
- 5.4 Create transparency through reporting and disclosure of environmental and health impacts throughout the supply chain, especially in industrial production systems (e.g., GHG emissions, annual number of heads of animals slaughtered, milk intake, etc., differentiated by production system).
- 5.5 Support the transition to a circular economy through regulatory measures that both promote regenerative production methods and minimize food loss and waste.
- 5.6 Phase out/minimize applications of chemical fertilizer, chemical pesticides/herbicides, and antibiotics.
- 5.7 Promote disclosure of feed and food produced with unsustainable, unhealthy, and unjust practices (e.g., pesticide use, synthetic fertilizers, GMO seed, antibiotics).

- 5.8 Ensure good animal welfare as well as sanitary controls and waste reduction in animal rearing and transport.
- 5.9 Minimize food loss and waste by requiring food manufacturers to measure and eliminate waste and maximize reuse of by-products, adopting cold storage and innovative equipment/business models to transform surplus edible food on farms into nutritious value-added food products, reforming expiration and “best before” dates requirements, removing barriers related to safety concerns and liability for donors to support donation and redistribution of healthful, nutritious food, and, when redistribution is not possible, supporting reuse of food by-products for animal feed as well as composting programs.

6. Adopt strong food-based sustainable dietary guidelines (FBSGDs). FBSGDs serve as a basis for public food and nutrition, health and agricultural policies, and nutrition education programs to foster healthy eating habits and lifestyles. They are also important tools for public education, used both by individual citizens and companies. Over 100 predominantly high- and middle-income countries have food-based dietary guidelines, and yet only a few have incorporated sustainability criteria into their guidelines.

- 6.1 Adopt FBSGDs in all countries, taking into account cultural and geographical differences and criteria related to health, nutrition, climate, and biodiversity. The development of such guidelines should be based on independent processes, include multiple stakeholder perspectives such as consumers and farmers, and avoid conflict of interest from invested stakeholders.
- 6.2 Align national investment, education, and agriculture strategies, along with public procurement (such as school feeding programs), with FBSGDs.
- 6.3 Change national dietary recommendations, particularly where linked to public purchases, to support diversification of protein sources toward more beans, pulses, and other sources of unprocessed or minimally processed plant-based protein and less animal protein, particularly where consumption of animal protein and saturated fat is high or growing.

7. Leverage public procurement policies to create large-scale demand for healthy, sustainable food and strengthen links to local and regional producers. Public institutions determine the types of food available in healthcare facilities, catering facilities, vending machines, etc., and therefore have an ability and responsibility to set environmental, social, as well as economic criteria on food purchases. Such criteria should take into account not only what food is purchased (i.e., local, seasonal, healthy) but also from who (e.g., local smallholder farmers, small and medium food enterprises and other vulnerable suppliers), and from what type of production practices (e.g., that ensure environmental sustainability and biodiversity).

- 7.1 Encourage the creation of transparent and sustainable value chains through procurement practices, such as increased access to information on products/ services, joint audits, and contract follow up.

7.2 Increase the knowledge, awareness, and skills of procurement professionals in the public sector by establishing global and regional networks of food procurement professionals that allow a better and more structured exchange of knowledge and experience to drive sustainable innovation in food procurement.

7.3 Establish a strong economic control, examination, and evaluation of procurement processes.

8. Minimize exposure to health-harmful food marketing and ensure appropriate labelling to improve food selection and encourage healthier diets.

Governments should recognize food industry responsibility in relation to their advertising practices, and apply regulatory restrictions to minimize exposure, particularly of children, to the marketing of ultra-processed foods high in fats, salts, and sugars. Food labelling should enable people to choose in line with recommendations in sustainable, healthy dietary guidelines.

8.1 Label products for their carbon footprint, nutritional content, method of production for meat, eggs, and dairy, and the contribution to nature restoration and diversification, to help direct consumer choices toward regenerative alternatives, as well as drive more investment and market development from this heightened demand.

8.2 Engage retailers to utilize a wide range of tools to drive demand for healthier, more sustainable choices.

9. Require accounting and financial disclosure on investment and lending practices for large companies and financial institutions that integrate the economic, natural, social, and human capital costs to identify food systems risks. Integrated accounting and financial disclosure creates more transparency and accountability across the supply chain, helping to expose the financial, ecological, social, and health risks associated with industrialized agriculture, concentrated livestock production, processing, marketing, and consumption.

9.1 Use the publicly available data generated from this process for independent monitoring and assessment of the risks and support strategies to change lending practices and diversify investments to support healthy, renewable, resilient, and equitable food systems.

FINANCIAL REFORM

1. Develop a portfolio of holistic metrics to better assess food systems and climate change impacts in order to inform planning and investments.

Complex systems require holistic measurements, metrics, and indicators for planetary and human health. While CO₂ is an important metric for assessing climate and energy impacts, additional metrics (such as resilience assessments) are needed to assess impacts on people, livelihoods, health, community resilience, biodiversity, land and soil, water, and other ecosystem services to minimize the unintended consequences of policies, investments, and practices.

1.1 Integrate material food systems and sustainability variables into existing accounting standards and reporting and disclosure frameworks for climate-related and other emerging risks, building on recommendations by the Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures and frameworks such as those by CDP, the Climate Disclosure Standards Board, the Global Reporting Initiative, the International Integrated Reporting Council, and the Sustainability Accounting Standards Board.

2. Assess and incorporate the positive and negative externalities into investment decisions and accounting frameworks, via a True Cost Accounting approach, in order to better reflect the true cost and value of food and highlight opportunities for innovation.

Most investment decisions are calculated based on short-term economic profits without an assessment of the externalities. Investors are increasingly aware of the risk of stranded assets associated with fossil fuels as well as climate-related risks such as flooding and temperature changes. Similar assessments are needed for investment decisions in food systems to mitigate not only climate-related risks but also other ecological, social, and human health risks generated by food systems practices.

2.1 Support investor engagement strategies that urge businesses to do holistic risk analyses related to food systems investments, such as climate and health impacts, and to hold them accountable to the risks.

2.2 Encourage businesses to mitigate and minimize negative externalities and maximize positive externalities (opportunities) in investment decisions by internalizing them into operating costs and revenues.

3. De-risk investments in agroecology, regenerative practices, and circular food systems through blended finance, insurance, and other risk-reduction mechanisms. Blended finance, the use of government and/or philanthropic capital to leverage private capital, reduces the perceived investment risks of innovative or alternative practices and initiatives in agroecological and regenerative production practices and food loss and waste. Governments and philanthropic projects should undertake due diligence measures, above and beyond those required for corporations, to ensure that public and philanthropic funds are not used in ways that unintentionally undercut broader transformative aims.

4. Develop markets for ecosystem services with transparent metrics and strong social safeguards. Models and mechanisms for financing climate programs are expanding rapidly, from soil and landscape carbon finance and ecosystem service payments to investment tools with a range of metrics, indicators, and disclosure requirements. These developments open up new horizons as well as controversies and equity concerns that require more evaluation and research.

4.1 Require transparent metrics and strong social and environmental safeguards developed with the full participation of local communities in carbon pricing measures to ensure that they consider the multiple co-benefits that go with carbon sequestration in forests and soils, including for biodiversity and livelihoods.

4.2 Build greater transparency around benchmarking and indicators and monitoring tools to quantify ecosystem service improvements for voluntary markets and third-party certification.

4.3 Ensure carbon credits cover carbon capture above and below ground, in farmland trees, shrubs, and grass vegetation, and in soils as well as forests; be based on net GHG accounting; and report on the certainty/uncertainty of metrics used.

5. **Assess and incorporate soil health quality in land valuation methodologies.**

Land's soil properties are undervalued in real estate markets. Land valuation determines the level of property taxes and land prices. The inclusion of soil quality (or potential improvements) in land valuation could support farmer transition to agroecological and regenerative production practices, e.g., with conditional lending programs tied to soil quality.

6. **Mobilize international climate finance and other international financing mechanisms to support Just Transitions and abstain from funding destructive monoculture and industrial animal agriculture systems.**

Focus climate finance (e.g., the Green Climate Fund, the Adaptation Fund), multilateral development banks, and bilateral donors on supporting Just Transition planning and implementation in Southern countries and marginalized communities in Northern countries with inclusive, transparent, accountable decision-making over deployment of funds for social protection. Funds are needed to enable vulnerable groups impacted by climate change (such as youth, women, Indigenous Peoples, smallholders, and pastoralists) to diversify, enhance resilience, and/or transition to other sectors. For example:

6.1 Ensure green economy plans allocate funds for a Just Transition so that countries have adequate finance attached to support Just Transitions for agri-food systems.

6.2 Advocate for the Global Environment Facility to establish a decentralized biodiversity fund to support resilience-building by Indigenous Peoples and local communities in ecosystem-based adaptation.

6.3 Review and transform the portfolios, investments, and modalities of international, multinational, and bilateral funding institutions away from monoculture and industrial animal agriculture in favour of equitable, resilient, sustainable, and healthy food systems, such as via small-scale farmers and agroecological approaches, formal and informal markets, catering services, and other small food businesses.

PRACTICE REFORM

1. **Support and facilitate agroecological and regenerative farming and fishery practices** at the community level and beyond, including the adoption of bioregional, territorial, and circular food systems and integrated landscape approaches that protect, promote, and support smallholder farmers, fishers, and Indigenous Peoples while halting deforestation. Farming practices include no-till/minimum tillage to enhance soil aggregation, water infiltration and retention, and carbon sequestration; utilizing cover crops, crop rotation, compost, and animal manure to increase soil

fertility; full-time planting of multiple crop intercrop plantings, multispecies cover crops, and borders planted for bee habitat and other beneficial insects to build biological ecosystem diversity; employing well-managed grazing practices to stimulate improved plant growth, increased soil carbon deposits, and overall pasture and grazing land productivity while greatly increasing soil fertility, insect and plant biodiversity, and soil carbon sequestration. Re-integrating crop–livestock systems reduces the externalities caused by separating animals and their ecosystem services from the crop production landscape by supporting more natural nutrient cycling while reducing on-farm waste. Sustainable fishery practices include ecosystem-based marine fisheries management and aquaculture based on healthy, balanced feedstock and without reliance on dangerous chemicals, hormones, or antibiotics.

- 1.1 Create or support existing networks and research that work to promote, and make the case for, agroecological and regenerative approaches.
- 1.2 Provide technical and marketing assistance to producers that would like to identify alternative ways to generate income and diversify production that provides more resilience and does not rely on a single market/customer.

2. Foster collaboration across stakeholders and sectors and within industry to support and mainstream sustainable, innovative production practices and encourage healthy, sustainable dietary choices. Collaboration, alongside public support measures, are critical to overcoming barriers to adoption at scale. The private sector has a responsibility to engage in new forms of inclusive, equitable partnership and collaborations, particularly with those most impacted, as a part of its investment in innovation.

- 2.1 Foster collaboration between animal agriculture stakeholder networks and ranching/farming communities to build trust, enhance knowledge sharing, and generate greater market and technical support for mainstreaming sustainable livestock grazing management.
- 2.2 Foster collaboration between farmers, the health sector, the hospitality sector, social entrepreneurs, retailers, scientists, educators, and consumers to pioneer innovative socio-economic approaches and promote healthy dietary shifts.
- 2.3 Foster collaboration and activity harmonization between farmers and fisheries to minimize watershed and coastal pollution.

3. Improve supply chain transparency and traceability of crops, livestock, seafood, and feedstock in order to improve production practices and reduce food loss and waste.

- 3.1 Support sustainable and responsible sourcing measures with safeguards to protect and support the transition of smallholder producers.

4. Harness the power of digitalization to help small- and medium-size farmers and fishers, and SMMEs, directly access information, technology, and markets, thereby increasing their incomes and improving their livelihoods. Inclusion and

empowerment requires the democratization of technology and data to ensure equitable access for all, especially for those who are less well-off or have less access to capital, women as the majority of smallholder farmers, and youth as the future of farming and fishing.

- 5. Commit to healthier product development and change how food is labelled and marketed to influence consumer behaviour, dietary choices, and reduce waste,** for example by improving products' labels and best before/expiration dates and applying marketing strategies and tools that encourage the purchase of imperfect, seasonal, local, and healthy whole foods.
- 6. Improve labour conditions for all workers in food systems, especially precarious, informal, seasonal, and migrant workers and support fair pricing for producers.**
 - 6.1 Facilitate access to and support collective bargaining so workers receive fair wages and conditions.
 - 6.2 Enable collective bargaining by producer associations to gain a fair price from processors and retailers.

INNOVATION & RESEARCH

- 1. Reinvest in public research, development assistance, and institutional reform in support of agroecological, regenerative, and circular food systems practices.**

Recent agricultural research has been characterized by privatization and growing capture of the research agenda toward a handful of cash crops with high profitability for export, or with value chains that are controlled by the biggest corporations. This has diverted public research away from agroecological, biodiverse practices and generated proprietary inputs, seeds, and technologies that are too expensive for small-scale farmers.

 - 1.1 Provide public funding to strengthen local and traditional knowledge, support participatory and transdisciplinary research, encourage farmer-to-farmer knowledge exchange and dissemination, and support public-private platforms to develop circular economy business models and innovative practices across food systems.
 - 1.2 Examine and quantify linkages and climate benefits of agroecological and regenerative production practices, food loss and waste reduction, and healthier diets.
 - 1.3 Research the nutritional and health benefits of diversified food production based on agroecological and regenerative practices (e.g., links between soil health and gut health) and diversified, more plant-based whole-food diets (i.e., via holistic assessment of nutrients in foods).
 - 1.4 Strengthen the linkages between academic research and food systems stakeholders, including traditional knowledge holders, to shorten the loop between research and action.
 - 1.5 Encourage private research and development investment by food companies to deliver sustainable, healthy, and equitable products.

2. **Support public and private investment in innovation and technologies to reduce food loss and waste.** Examples include “smart harvesting” that tracks maturation and optimizes harvests, preservation techniques such as edible coating for fruit, energy-efficient cold-chain technologies to keep fruit and vegetables fresher longer during storage and transport, smart packaging to increase product shelf life and improve consumer decisions, or data-sharing to better match supply and demand. Innovations should target key issues linked to food waste, e.g., supply chain coordination, overproduction, stringent aesthetic standards, lack of processing facilities, and difficulties in recruiting seasonal workers at the right moment to harvest produce. Public–private partnerships are important to ensure that new technologies are scalable.

3. **Deepen investment in behavioural research on dietary shifts and waste reduction in food systems,** especially in emerging economies where there are gaps in research.

STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS, AWARENESS-RAISING, & MOVEMENT-BUILDING

1. **Support and elevate positive examples through pilot demonstrations, campaigns, and strategic communications.** Compelling narratives and examples highlight the critical role food, agriculture, and soil can play in alleviating climate change; demonstrate how integrated food systems approaches based on inclusive governance processes enhance livelihood and community resilience; and, more importantly, provide hope and optimism for action around solutions. They must be paired with well-crafted campaign and communication strategies, using both data and storytelling, to create the political will and stakeholder/investor support needed to turn narratives into action. Narratives and key messages must be crafted and carried by messengers that are differentiated to resonate with the specific target audience, whether different parts of government, financial institutions, consumers, or producers.
 - 1.1 Analyze patterns of success and communicate positive examples in policy and practice to better articulate alternative narratives, shared values (e.g., resiliency, health, conservation), and benefits and to demonstrate the portfolio of levers needed and inspire similar locally adapted initiatives.
 - 1.2 Create traction for positive examples and roadmaps by creating political and public pressure via “naming and shaming” campaigns.

2. **Develop and support citizen education, awareness, and action programs adapted to local contexts that focus on concrete actions and the celebration of food.** Greater ecological, food, and health literacy influences citizen behaviour, encourages action for policy change, and reconnects people with food and the natural world.
 - 2.1 Create linkages (e.g., urban with rural, non-farmer with farmer) by involving actors across food systems to bring awareness to growing, preservation, and cooking

experiences, as well as other activities that foster an appreciation of cultural traditions, heritage, and diversity of foodways.

- 2.2 Promote school vegetable gardens and introduce principles of food sovereignty and agroecology in school curricula.
- 2.3 Work with “intermediaries” (e.g., journalists, NGOs, think tanks, universities, teachers, educators) to translate and disseminate knowledge about sustainable food systems.
- 2.4 Support professional education and training (i.e., in the healthcare, nutrition, and catering sectors) to build and promote more sustainable and healthy diets and food environments.
- 2.5 Expose the influence of food advertising and marketing strategies, particularly on children, and the negative human, animal, and ecological health and well-being impacts of meat and dairy produced in concentrated animal feed operations.

3. Support movement-building by civil society organizations and grassroots organizations and by citizen action through financial and capacity-building support, and by fostering local network-building and interaction between producers and consumers. Strengthen the connections between food sovereignty movements and other movements such as environmental justice, labour, hunger, and anti-racism/structural oppression.

4. Support consumer campaigns focused on less and better meat, dairy, and fish consumption, especially in countries with over-consumption of animal protein, such as promoting meatless Mondays, engaging celebrity chefs to introduce alternative recipes with lower (or no) meat on the plate, and providing incentives to purchase less and better animal protein.

APPENDIX: ANALYSIS OF PERSPECTIVES ENGAGED

We would like to acknowledge the participation and diversity of perspectives of all the individuals who participated in the Salzburg Process discussions during 4–6 May 2020 and/or subsequently provided feedback on an early draft Shared Action Framework. Below we share an analysis of the sectoral, demographic, and geographic representation of those who participated in the events or in the feedback process.

	APRIL & MAY	MAY 4-6	FEEDBACK PROCESS		APRIL & MAY	MAY 4-6	FEEDBACK PROCESS
Environment: organization, alliance, movement	78	43	12	Africa	30	7	3
Farmers: organization, alliance, movement	10	3	6	Asia	34	10	5
Finance or investment	28	3	1	Europe	201	97	35
Health: organization, alliance, movement	9	6	2	International / UN	22	6	2
Indigenous Peoples: organization, alliance, movement	3	0	1	North America	150	78	24
International or Pan-national Institution	28	13	2	Oceania	4	2	2
Labour: organization, alliance, movement	1	1	1	South America	30	11	8
Multi-stakeholder platform or alliance	19	6	2	TOTAL	471	211	79
National government or agency	5	1	0				
Other	4	1	0				
Philanthropy	80	46	7				
Private sector initiative or company	50	11	8				
Research/think tank	81	45	20				
Social justice: organization, alliance, movement	57	27	15				
Strategic Communications	9	2	0				
Sub-national or local government	8	2	1				
Youth: organization, alliance, movement	1	1	1				
TOTAL	471	211	79				

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Salzburg Process on the Climate Emergency and the Future of Food has been a partnership between the Global Alliance and Salzburg Global Seminar, and we are deeply appreciative of the opportunity to work together to spark collective action. We would like to gratefully acknowledge the many people involved in the planning process.

The Global Alliance's Climate Impact Area Committee must be acknowledged for its leadership and vision. Its commitment to advancing the food-climate nexus is deeply appreciated throughout the planning process. Climate Impact Area members include representatives from the following foundations: 11th Hour Project, Agropolis Fondation, Azim Premji Philanthropic Initiatives, The Christensen Fund, Clarence E. Heller Charitable Foundation, Fondation Daniel et Nina Carasso, David Rockefeller Fund, GRACE Communications Foundation, J.W. McConnell Family Foundation, McKnight Foundation, Oak Foundation, Tudor Trust, and V. Kann Rasmussen Foundation. The planning process was supported with extensive input and feedback by an external Advisory Committee (Richie Ahuja, Million Belay, Karl Burkart, Emma Chow, Bill Dietz, Liz Gallagher, Gabriel Lui, Satheesh Periyapatna, Amita Ramachandran, Debbie Reed, Peter Riggs, Shefali Sharma, Boyd Swinburn, Zachary Tofias, Ana Toni, Sonja Vermuelen). This work was generously funded by the following foundations: David Rockefeller Fund, V. Kann Rasmussen Foundation, Crown Family Philanthropies, and the Oak Foundation. We extend deep gratitude to the Global Alliance secretariat (Ruth Richardson, Executive Director; Patty Fong, Program Director, Climate and Health & Well-being; Lauren Baker, Senior Director of Programs; Kasia Murphy, Director of Communications; Anne Valette, Program Coordinator; Meena Nallainathan, Program Coordinator; Amanda Jekums, Program Coordinator; and Pablo Vidueira, Blue Marble Evaluation Consultant). We deeply appreciate the support of the Salzburg Global Seminar team (Clare Shine, former Vice President and Chief Program Officer; Benjamin Glahn, Vice President and Chief Operating Officer; Beth Pertiller, Director of Operations; Jennifer Dunn, Program Development Associate; Thomas Biebl, Vice President, Public Affairs; Antonia Boemeke, Program Development Assistant), the facilitators (Todd Barker, Senior Partner and Practice Director at Meridian Institute; Isabella Freire Vitali, Latin America Co-Director at ProForest), and our volunteer (Samara Brock). This process has been all the stronger due to their professional hands in helping to shape its form and content from beginning to end.

ENDNOTES

- 1 An industrial system can be defined as food and farming practices based on chemical-intensive agriculture, intensive livestock production, the mass production and mass marketing of ultra-processed foods, and the development of long and deregulated global commodity supply chains (IPES-Food. 2017. *Unravelling the Food–Health Nexus: Addressing practices, political economy, and power relations to build healthier food systems*. The Global Alliance for the Future of Food and IPES-Food).
- 2 Ultra-processed foods can be defined as industrial formulations that, besides salt, sugar, oils, and fats, include substances not used in culinary preparations, in particular additives used to imitate sensorial qualities of minimally processed foods and their culinary preparations (IPES-Food. 2017. *Unravelling the Food–Health Nexus: Addressing practices, political economy, and power relations to build healthier food systems*. The Global Alliance for the Future of Food and IPES-Food).
- 3 The history and principles underpinning the concept of a Just Transition are discussed in the discussion paper on Just Transitions available [here](#).
- 4 The history and principles underpinning agroecology, regenerative agriculture, and other related practices are discussed in the discussion paper on Nature-Based Solutions available [here](#).
- 5 The history and principles underpinning agroecology, regenerative agriculture, and other related practices are covered in the “Nature-Based Solutions” discussion paper. Definitions for healthy and sustainable diets are mentioned in the “Sustainable and Health Diets” discussion paper. Both papers can be found [here](#). A definition of circular food systems practices can be found [here](#).