

10YFP Sustainable Food Systems Programme

2nd MAC meeting (teleconference)

Tuesday, March 1st, 2016
3 to 6 p.m. CET

Summary report

Summary of main outcomes and decisions:

- The **summary report of the Kick-off event** in Milan was adopted.
- The **SFS Programme could not be formally validated by the 10YFP Board yet**, as one Board member has raised some queries regarding certain elements of the programme document.
- The **Terms of Reference (ToR)** have been adopted.
- The MAC has **confirmed WWF as an additional Co-Lead** of the Programme.
- In order to **fill the vacant seat in the civil society cluster of the MAC**, the Co-Leads will launch a call for expressions of interest among Programme Partners that are civil society organizations and propose a list of candidates. The Partners from the civil society cluster will finally take a vote.
- According to an evaluation of expressions of interest by the Co-Leads, **40 organizations will be endorsed as Programme Partners** in a first step, another 51 applications are still under consideration. The Coordination Desk will keep the MAC updated on the status of Partners.
- The Coordination Desk will create a consolidated version of the **list of priority activities** according to the results of the discussion and share it with the MAC members.
- The **Work plan outline (2016-2017)** will have to be filled with the priority activities and the concrete projects/activities by the work area groups. The Co-Leads will propose a timeline for the completion of this task.
- All four **work area groups should reconvene for further discussions on priority activities**, which could include a collection of experiences and project ideas within their groups, as a basis to identify concrete projects/activities to be included in the work plan.
- MAC members are invited to inform the Coordination Desk if they are interested to **volunteer as work area coordinators**.
- As the SCP Clearinghouse website is not quite ready at this moment, the Coordination Desk will look into alternative **solutions to facilitate the exchange of information and documents** within the MAC and across the work areas.
- The aim would be that each of the 10YFP programmes can open one **Trust Fund call for proposals** every year. A first call for proposals for the SFS Programme should be elaborated soon.
- The SFS Programme could both participate in existing **10YFP flagship projects** of other Programmes as well as develop new ones. The 10YFP Secretariat offers further briefing on the topic of flagship projects through a webinar.
- The **next face-to-face MAC meeting will take place in Rome**, back-to-back with a workshop on sustainable value chains organized by FAO. Possible dates are May 23rd to 25th or June 7th to 9th. The Coordination Desk will send out a poll to check availability.
- WWF will share a report on the global food system and offers to organize a webinar on the topic.

1. Introduction

1.1 Welcome

Mr. Adrian Aebi, *Assistant Director-General, Federal Office for Agriculture (Switzerland)*, welcomed all participants to the second MAC meeting, especially also the ones who were not able to attend the Kick-off event in Milan. After summarizing the most important outcomes and decisions of the first MAC meeting held in Milan in October 2015, he presented the agenda and explained that the main objectives for the meeting would be to adopt the Terms of Reference of the SFS Programme, to agree on a first set of priority activities under the work areas of the Programme, and to initiate a first discussion on the 10YFP Trust Fund and flagship projects.

1.2 Adoption of summary report of 1st MAC meeting (Kick-off event)

Before going into the content of the second MAC meeting, Mr. Aebi presented the summary report of the Kick-off event in Milan for adoption. As there were no further comments, he declared the report as adopted.

2. Issues related to the governance and membership

2.1 Formal validation by the 10YFP Board

Mr. Aebi invited Charles Arden-Clarke, *Head of the 10YFP Secretariat, United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)*, to provide an update on the current status of the programme validation. Mr. Arden-Clarke informed the Co-Leads and MAC members that the 10YFP Secretariat had requested a response from the 10YFP Board by February 29th, 2016, but that unfortunately formal validation had not yet been obtained, as one Board member raised some queries regarding certain elements of the SFS programme document which need to be addressed. However, Mr. Arden-Clarke asserted his confidence that the SFS Programme will be formally validated within the next days.

2.2 Considerations of Terms of Reference

Introducing the Terms of Reference (ToR) of the SFS Programme, Mr. Aebi explained that the adoption of this document will be an important step towards the implementation of the Programme.

A discussion took place on whether individual experts should be able to become Partners of the SFS Programme. Mr. Patrick Mink, *Policy Advisor at the Federal Office for Agriculture (Switzerland)*, clarified that the understanding in drafting the ToR was that any individual expert who wishes to become a Partner of the SFS Programme, needs to be registered as an organization or business under national law. It was agreed that this should be specified in the ToR.

Furthermore, clarification was requested on the inclusion of the new section 6 on “monitoring and evaluation”. Mr. Frank Mechielsen, *Senior Advocacy Officer Food at Hivos*, explained that this was done to ensure that a mechanism for measuring the Programme’s progress will be put in place. In this context, Mr. Arden-Clarke added that the 10YFP Secretariat had recently developed draft indicators for the 10YFP which will be circulated with all 10YFP Programmes soon, and he explained that the 10YFP Secretariat can provide some support to the 10YFP Programmes regarding the development of monitoring frameworks. Peter Denton offered that IISD could contribute to the development and monitoring of indicators for the SFS Programme.

After clarification of these two issues and in the absence of any further concerns raised by the MAC, Mr. Aebi declared the Terms of Reference as adopted.

2.3 Membership issues

2.3.1 Update regarding the Co-Leadership

Mr. Aebi reminded the MAC members that WWF had also expressed interest in being part of the co-leadership team of the SFS Programme and was among those recommended by the 10YFP Secretariat, however it was impossible to obtain an official reconfirmation from WWF prior to the Kick-off event. He went on to explain that in the meantime WWF has formally reconfirmed its commitment to act as a Co-Lead of the Programme, and he invited Mr. Jochen Krimphoff to briefly present WWF's motivation to act as a Co-Lead of the Sustainable Food Systems Programme.

Mr. Krimphoff stated that it would be an honor for WWF to be part of the co-leadership team of the SFS Programme, and he highlighted that, as WWF is also co-leading the 10YFP Sustainable Lifestyles and Education Programme, WWF could contribute towards creating synergies between the SFS and the SLE Programmes, thereby creating additional value for both Programmes.

As there were no objections from the MAC, Mr. Aebi welcomed WWF as a Co-Lead of the Sustainable Food Systems Programme.

2.3.2 Update regarding the MAC composition

Mr. Aebi reminded the MAC members that, as a consequence of WWF becoming a Co-Lead of the SFS Programme, a seat will become vacant in the civil society organizations cluster of the MAC. He explained that, according to the Terms of Reference which were adopted earlier in this meeting, a call for expressions of interest to become a MAC member will be launched, open to all Programme Partners that are civil society organizations. The Coordination Desk will carry out a first evaluation of applicants, based on which the Co-Leads will propose a list of candidates. The new MAC member will then be elected by the Partners that are civil society organizations taking into account regional balance

A discussion took place on whether instead of opening a call for expressions of interest, the vacant seat should be offered to the organization that was ranked next in the civil society cluster in the initial vote for MAC members prior to the Kick-off event in Milan. The issue was put to a vote, and a large majority of the MAC members was in favor of following the procedure explained by Mr. Aebi and defined in the Terms of Reference.

2.3.3 Update regarding the Programme Partners

Mr. Aebi explained that in December 2015, the 10YFP Secretariat informed the Co-Leads that they would have to evaluate all the expressions of interest from organizations that applied to become a Partner of the SFS Programme. The results of this evaluation are as follows:

- 40 partner applications were positively evaluated and will thus be endorsed as Programme Partners;
- another 13 expressions of interest were also positively evaluated, however these institutions had applied to become either a Lead/Co-Lead or MAC member. The Coordination Desk will follow up with these institutions, inviting them to become Partners;
- furthermore, 38 applicants are still under consideration, as they need to provide some additional information.

The Coordination Desk will inform all the applicants according to this evaluation, and keep the MAC updated about the status of SFS Programme Partners.

It was highlighted that it would be desirable to have more regional balance within the Programme, and specifically more Partners from Asia and Africa, and from private sector. In this context, Dominique Wolf, *Policy Advisor at the Federal Office for Agriculture (Switzerland)* offered to share with the MAC members a complete list of organizations that applied to become a partner of the SFS Programme, so that they get an overview of the regional distribution of current applicants.

3. Issues related to the work programme

3.1 Consideration of priority activities

Mr. Mechielsen reminded the MAC members that at the 1st MAC meeting in Milan, a first discussion on priority activities within the SFS Programme took place, and it was decided to continue these discussions under the four work areas. Several MAC members volunteered to continue the discussion. In the meantime, the different work area groups proposed a list of priority activities, which the Coordination Desk attempted to consolidate into one coherent document. Mr. Mechielsen explained that the list of priority activities contained in the document is not finite, and that the work area groups would have the possibility to propose additional priority activities in the future.

Following this introduction, Mr. Mechielsen invited the facilitators of the work area group discussions to briefly summarize the results of the discussions within each of the four work areas. In the subsequent discussion, it was discussed that:

WA1:

- could focus on awareness raising and the transfer of knowledge, whereas priority activities concerning metrics / methodologies may be moved to WA3;

WA2:

- could focus on building enabling environments for sustainable food systems, including making available, share and use data and relevant tools (whereas the development of such tools would fall under WA3);
- additional priority activities to the ones in the document are currently under discussion in the work area group and may be proposed to be added in the future;
- the group proposed to add one additional priority activity (under 2.4) at this stage regarding organizing training and capacity development for different stakeholders, which was accepted by the MAC;
- regarding innovative market mechanisms (2.2), it was suggested to not only look at ecosystems services, but to also consider other market mechanisms;
- regarding priority activity 2.1.a) it was suggested to make explicit reference to civil society organizations as well as research and technical institutions;
- under 2.4.a), a reference to “building on existing policy guidelines” may be added;
- under 2.4.a), a reference to “sharing studies and “disseminating best practices” may be added;
- under 2.5 a new priority activity “promote the implementation of the Principles for responsible investment in agriculture and food systems” could be added;

WA3:

- is about metrics / methodologies, whereas priority activities with a focus on awareness raising and knowledge transfer can be moved to WA1;
- sub-work area 3.1. can be moved to WA1; under 3.1., a new priority activity “Facilitate knowledge generation, access and sharing on all the dimensions of the sustainability of food systems” may be added;
- priority activity 3.3.a) should refer to *methodologies*, not *methodology*; the first part of it could be reworded “Identify methodologies and develop tools (including indicators) to assess and promote the sustainability of diets, [...]”;
- priority activity 3.3.b) could be understood as focusing on the development of technical tools and databases, including the identification of benchmarks (whereas making available, share and use data and relevant tools would fall under WA2);
- the group agreed that the three priority activities marked in yellow should be moved here;

WA4:

- could focus on strengthening a mechanism for multi-stakeholder engagement, and how to connect this with other 10YFP Programmes and the SDGs;
- under 4.2., a new priority activity “Use potential synergies with the Public Procurement Programme to improve the sustainability of food systems, including by facilitating access to markets” could be added;

In addition, a point was raised regarding thematic issues that cut across several of the four work areas, such as food losses and waste or sustainable diets. One MAC member suggested that cross-cutting

working groups could be established to address such topics. Mr. Mechielsen stated that there would be space for a discussion on such topics at the next face to face MAC meeting.

Mr. Mechielsen summarized that, in accordance with the above discussions:

- certain priority activities will be moved between the four work areas, in particular to work area 3;
- some additional priority activities will be added;
- and some priority activities may need some further refinement. This would require follow-up discussions within the work area groups.

The Coordination Desk will create a consolidated version of the list of priority activities and share it with the MAC members.

3.2 Consideration of work plan outline (2016-2017)

Mr. Mechielsen very briefly introduced the document “Work plan outline (2016-2017)”. This is the template that will have to be filled with the priority activities and the concrete projects/activities that will be implemented under the four work areas. These inputs are expected to come from the work area groups, in order for the Coordination Desk to be able to produce a consolidated draft work plan for consideration at the next face to face MAC meeting. The Co-Leads will propose a timeline for the completion of this task after the teleconference.

3.3 Organization of work under the four Work Areas

3.3.1 Development of the work plan (2016-2017)

Mr. Mechielsen suggested that all four work area groups should reconvene for further discussions on priority activities, as needed. He mentioned that some of the groups have already started to collect experiences and project ideas within their groups. Such an approach could be adopted in a coherent way across all four work areas, as a basis to identify concrete projects/activities to be included in the work plan. Therefore, Mr. Mechielsen proposed that once the priorities are agreed within the groups, all four groups could carry out such a mapping exercise. Such an exercise could include a mapping of their respective projects/activities that relate to the agreed priority activities, and collecting project proposals that are in line with these priority activities. The WA3 group has shared the outcomes of the mapping exercise it carried with the Co-Leads. The Coordination Desk could share this as an example with the other MAC members.

3.3.2 Working modalities under the Work Areas

Under this agenda item, Mr. Mechielsen invited the MAC members to volunteer as work area coordinators. Any MAC member interested in acting as a work area coordinator should inform the Coordination Desk after the MAC teleconference. An immediate next task for the work area coordinators will be to facilitate the mapping exercise referred to under 3.3.1 above.

In this context, Mr. Mechielsen highlighted that the work area groups remain open to all MAC members, that those MAC members who until now have not been involved in the work areas are welcome to join one or several of the groups, and that all MAC members should be invited to contribute to the respective mapping exercises under all four work areas. At a later stage, the work areas will also be open for collaboration to Programme Partners.

Some MAC members expressed the concern that there may be a lack of information between the different work area groups. It was suggested that a mechanism should be established to facilitate the exchange of information and documents within the MAC and across the work areas. The Coordination Desk informed that the SCP Clearinghouse website is currently being updated to serve that purpose, but that it is not quite ready at this moment. It was suggested to look into alternative solutions in the meantime. The Coordination Desk will explore such alternatives.

4. Issues related to the 10YFP more broadly

Ms. Thembelihle Ndukwana, *Director: Agro-Processing, Department of Trade and Industry (South Africa)*, gave the floor to Mr. Arden-Clarke to provide an introduction to the 10YFP Trust Fund and its functioning.

4.1 Presentation of the 10YFP Trust Fund and its functioning

Mr. Arden-Clarke explained that so far, every Trust Fund call for proposals of the other 10YFP programmes amounted to a total of 500,000 USD, resulting in a total of three projects being selected for financial support per call. The Trust Fund is only intended to benefit countries that are developing countries, and as a general rule, for-profit organizations cannot apply for funds.

In the medium term, the aim would be that each of the 10YFP Programmes can open one Trust Fund call for proposals every year. Mr. Arden-Clarke advises that the SFS Programme starts to elaborate a call for proposals soon, hopefully still before the summer break (on the northern hemisphere), as experience shows that the process will take at least four months. He announced that the 10YFP Secretariat is prepared to work very closely with the Co-Leads and MAC on this issue.

4.2 Possible involvement in related flagship project proposals

4.2.1 Introduction to the notion of 10YFP flagship projects

Under this agenda item, Mr. Arden-Clarke introduced the notion of 10YFP flagship projects. He explained that the main objective of flagship projects is to get scale. The process typically consists in a small section of programme members designing a flagship project proposal, then consulting the proposal with other interested parties in order to finally present it to potential donors. So far, nine flagship project proposals went forward. Three such draft proposals were already distributed to National Focal Points as well as Stakeholder Focal Points of the 10YFP, and another two will be circulated soon.

The 10YFP Secretariat will send an information package on flagship projects to the Co-Leads for distribution. In addition, Mr. Arden-Clarke mentioned that further briefing on the topic of flagship projects could be provided through a webinar, if needed. The SFS Programme could both participate in existing 10YFP flagship projects of other Programmes as well as develop new ones.

4.2.2 Existing flagship proposals of other 10YFP programmes

Under this agenda item, Ms. Ndukwana gave the floor to Mr. Mechielsen and Mr. Mink to provide a broad overview over two of the flagship project proposals that are currently being developed under other 10YFP programmes and relate to the topic of sustainable food systems.

Mr. Mechielsen introduced the flagship project proposal “*Better by design*”, which is primarily being developed by members of the Consumer Information Programme. The project looks at how to make a product more sustainable, with about 50 percent of the project’s focus being on the food and beverage sector. It is planned to be implemented at global scale. The project lead is WRAP, with WWF also participating in the project implementation, amongst others. Some MAC members expressed interest in this project, and it was asked that the draft proposal should be shared again with the group for reference.

Mr. Mink presented the flagship project proposal “*Cutting food loss in hotels; building behavior change*”, which is being developed by the Sustainable Tourism Programme. It was discussed that whereas there is no doubt that the topic of food loss in hotels is related to sustainable food systems, this flagship project may be somewhat narrow in scope, focusing only on the hotel sector and mainly the reduction of CO₂ emissions. The overall feedback from the MAC was mixed, with some supporting an involvement in the project, while others argued that one should also look at food waste reduction in restaurants, schools, supermarkets, etc., to prioritize the most strategic sector and take into account further dimensions including how the tourism sector can boost the production of local and more nutritious food. In the context of this second flagship proposal, FAO and UNEP agreed to get in contact with each other in order to better coordinate their joint efforts in the area of food loss and waste reduction.

5. Next meeting and other business

5.1 Next face-to-face MAC meeting

Mr. Mink informed the MAC members that the next MAC meeting will be held in the form of a face-to-face MAC meeting in Rome, Italy, back-to-back with a workshop on sustainable value chains organized by FAO. He announced that the Coordination Desk will send out a doodle poll to fix the dates for these events, with the two following options: either 23-25 May, 2016, or 7-9 June, 2016.

5.2 Input by WWF

Mr. Richard Holland, *Director, WWF Market Transformation Initiative*, informed that WWF commissioned an external company to undertake a study on the global food system. The study can be downloaded online (<http://www.metabolic.nl/publications/global-food-system-analysis/>). He further announced that WWF had the intention to offer an opportunity to have a webinar on that study.

As there were no further requests for the floor, Mr. Mink thanked everyone for their active participation and for a very productive meeting.

Report: Patrick Mink and Dominique Wolf, FOAG (Switzerland)

Annex 1: List of Participants

Organization/country	Participant
<i>Government agencies</i>	
Brazil	Francisco Fujita de Castro Mello
Costa Rica	Roberto Azofeifa
France	Florence Scarsi
United States	Elise Golan
Honduras	Svetlana Samayoa
Honduras	Cristhiam Moncada
Argentina	Cecilia Hiriart
<i>Civil society organizations</i>	
Biovision	Michael Bergöö
IISD	Peter Denton
IFOAM	Gábor Figeczky
WWF	Jochen Krimphoff
WWF	Richard Holland
<i>Research and technical institutions</i>	
German Development Institute	Dr. Aimée Hampel-Milagrosa
Hebrew University	Elliot M Berry
ENEA	Milena Stefanova
<i>UN agencies and other international organizations</i>	
CIHEAM	Roberto Capone
CIHEAM	Hamid El Bilali
FAO	Sandro Dernini
UNEP	Clementine O'Connor
UNSCN	Stineke Oenema
<i>Private sector</i>	
FoodDrinkEurope	Tove Larsson
Nestlé	Anne Roulin
Nestlé	Urs Schenker
Smaackmakers	Natascha Kooiman
<i>Co-Leads</i>	
Hivos	Frank Mechielsen
South Africa	Thembelihle Ndukwana
Switzerland	Adrian Aebi
Switzerland	Patrick Mink
Switzerland	Dominique Wolf
10YFP Secretariat	Chares Arden-Clarke
10YFP Secretariat	Cecilia Lopez y Royo