



1.20 Foster shared learning on Food System Transformation Pathways

The solution: Promoting and supporting a country-owned process that brings a food system framework perspective to agri-food policy planning and implementation. This would lead to identifying new pathways for food system development, which could be embodied within a new cross-government, multi-stakeholder National Food System Development Plan or through refreshing an existing strategy. Stronger food system planning is an intermediate output of the process and an important guide to investing to transform food systems. These pathways will also consider conflict sensitivity and risk mitigation in food systems planning in countries affected by conflict.

Source(s) of the Solution: The AT-1 public idea survey database, leadership of AT1, and members of the AT1 zero hunger working group.

Problem addressed within food systems: Food systems transformation requires collaboration across many government ministries and agencies and with other stakeholders, all within a food systems framework. Existing policies and investments are inadequate for food systems transformation because they address separate components of food systems (e.g., agriculture, climate change, trade, consumer behaviour, health outcomes, prices, etc.) in isolation rather than at the system level. Because various components of the food system are interconnected and interact with each other, a change in one component may lead to unexpected or undesirable changes in other components. Without a food systems framework, to develop a transformation strategy, including learning from initiatives that intended similar cross-government and multi-stakeholder process (e.g., NAIP and SUN), the risk of incoherent action and wasted resources is significantly raised.

How this solution will address that problem: Addressing this problem is important for achieving the goals of the entire food system. This would be a cross-AT initiative and could support changes in the way governments and their partners think about, analyse, and strategize their food systems.

Theory of change: Learning about experiences of other countries who have adopted elements of food system planning and transformation pathway identification will make member states more comfortable with the process, will reveal strengths and weaknesses of others' processes, and will help build an appetite and a capacity for such work. This planning can help bring coherence among the various policies and interventions that are implemented to target different components of the food system. If so, the outcomes of the system are more likely to be achieved without adversely affecting other outcomes. Synergies can be derived across hunger reduction, nutrition, climate, environment, inclusive livelihoods, and resilience while minimising trade-offs. Strategies and frameworks are as good as the process that develops them. As countries are overwhelmed with plans, this process would need to (when possible) link existing plans, for example in agriculture, climate, and nutrition or simply infuse existing plans with a food system perspective.

- **Pre-Summit:** Develop a shared learning programme that (1) brings together countries that have some experience of undertaking food system planning and pathway identification (e.g., Guatemala, Ireland, Norway) or related processes (e.g., NAIPs/CAADP, NDCs/UNFCCC, NPANs/SUN) to build a knowledge base of the issues and challenges and (2) brings in data and evidence that can help describe, diagnose, and recommend potential courses of action.
- **Post-Summit:** Support countries to develop their own multi-stakeholder, multidisciplinary process to describe the current state of their food systems and actors. The learning would include (1) diagnosing and analysing the various outcomes, drivers, and choices available to (2) lead to



identifying relevant pathways for transforming the system with the right interventions and deliver on multiple outcomes. Highlighting **the right to food** will be important as a foundational value but also as an accountability mechanism.

Assumptions: This assumes that the process would be country-driven; that various implementing ministries are willing and able to work together to learn, own, develop, and eventually implement the plans accordingly (as such a plan will cut across many sectors); it may also require willingness to change existing policies and the ability (political will, appropriate timing) to do that. Finally, it assumes that support of the process is forthcoming from other member states and experts within and outside the country.

Solution’s alignment with the ‘game-changing and systemic solution’ criteria:

Impact potential: without a plan or identified transformation pathways and a process to develop them, action is likely to be incoherent.

Actionability: Several countries have expressed interest in the process of learning about and developing such planning capacity and, eventually, pathways or plans. Based on the CAADP National Agricultural Investment Plan (NAIP) (and Global Agriculture and Food Security Program, GAFSP) and SUN experience, preparing such a strategy itself is not too costly. The challenge is to get high-level political buy-in and develop sufficient capacity to implement it.

Sustainability: If the process is developed in a country-driven, country-owned way, with sensitive and responsive external support, then the process has every chance of being sustainable.

Existing evidence: Planning and identifying pathways are no panacea. But learning to plan and identify transformation pathways with a food system framing is likely to have large benefits and would be a game-changer in itself. It is not straightforward, however, and this initiative would help member states to prepare for the post-summit work by learning from the experiences of various member states.

At an individual plan level, the NAIP (or national agricultural and food security investment plan, NAFSIP) is an example of a multi-sectoral strategic plan with other non-agriculture components such as infrastructure, climate change, trade, gender and youth, and resilience among others to deliver on multiple outcomes including growth, employment, resilience, prosperity, food security, and nutrition. The NAIP was seen as an innovative solution for fighting hunger, malnutrition, and poverty, to the extent that the GAFSP, for example, evaluate proposals that have “been through a CAADP or CAADP-like due diligence process” and “provide grants to low-income country governments to support NAFSIPs developed together with farmers, agribusinesses, technical experts, and civil society organizations.”

Current/likely political support: Currently, a few member states of varying income levels expressed interest in developing these food systems transition pathways. These member states include Egypt, Guatemala, Ireland, Norway, and Philippines. We expect other member states to express interest as well.

Contexts where this is well/not well suited: The food system strategies are expected to be applicable across all contexts and at both the national and the subnational level.