

# OFFICIAL FEEDBACK FORM

<b>DIALOGUE DATE</b>	Monday, 12 July 2021 09:00 GMT +02:00
<b>DIALOGUE TITLE</b>	I sistemi alimentari nelle aree interne: politiche nazionali e coalizioni locali
<b>CONVENED BY</b>	Laura Prota, The American University of Rome (AUR)
<b>DIALOGUE EVENT PAGE</b>	<a href="https://summitdialogues.org/dialogue/13965/">https://summitdialogues.org/dialogue/13965/</a>
<b>DIALOGUE TYPE</b>	Independent
<b>GEOGRAPHICAL FOCUS</b>	Italy

The outcomes from a Food Systems Summit Dialogue will be of use in developing the pathway to sustainable food systems within the locality in which they take place. They will be a valuable contribution to the national pathways and also of interest to the different workstreams preparing for the Summit: the Action Tracks, Scientific Groups and Champions as well as for other Dialogues.

# 1. PARTICIPATION

## TOTAL NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS

66

## PARTICIPATION BY AGE RANGE

0-18

16

19-30

28

31-50

21

51-65

1

66-80

80+

## PARTICIPATION BY GENDER

31 Male

35 Female

Prefer not to say or Other

## NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS IN EACH SECTOR

11 Agriculture/crops

Fish and aquaculture

3 Livestock

1 Agro-forestry

1 Environment and ecology

Trade and commerce

23 Education

3 Communication

2 Food processing

5 Food retail, markets

Food industry

3 Financial Services

Health care

Nutrition

10 National or local government

Utilities

Industrial

4 Other

## NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS FROM EACH STAKEHOLDER GROUP

6 Small/medium enterprise/artisan

Large national business

Multi-national corporation

1 Small-scale farmer

2 Medium-scale farmer

Large-scale farmer

15 Local Non-Governmental Organization

2 International Non-Governmental Organization

Indigenous People

23 Science and academia

3 Workers and trade union

Member of Parliament

Local authority

12 Government and national institution

Regional economic community

United Nations

International financial institution

Private Foundation / Partnership / Alliance

Consumer group

Other

## 2. PRINCIPLES OF ENGAGEMENT

### HOW DID YOU ORGANIZE THE DIALOGUE SO THAT THE PRINCIPLES WERE INCORPORATED, REINFORCED AND ENHANCED?

Our dialogue has five thematic tables plus two plenary sessions to discuss cross-cutting issues and themes. Before our independent dialogue started, the curator translated the principles of engagement into Italian and disseminated them among curators and participants. Curators followed the principles of engagement when organizing their discussion tables in the following ways: 1) involving all types of stakeholders from national and local institutions to workers' and consumers' groups, private enterprises, cooperatives, and business networks, small-holders, processors, and financial institutions. 2) developing a scenario and a set of questions to discuss with participants. The scenarios and the related questions were circulated in advance among stakeholders to facilitate engagement. 3) asking stakeholders to react to the scenarios proposed and discuss the related issues based on their experiences and competencies. 4) identifying and addressing cross-cutting issues in the concluding plenary sessions to derive recommendations and findings.

### HOW DID YOUR DIALOGUE REFLECT SPECIFIC ASPECTS OF THE PRINCIPLES?

Our independent dialogue reflected on three specific aspects of engagement: A) **RECOGNIZE COMPLEXITY:** -----  
----- Out five discussion tables were consecutive to enable participants to sit in multiple discussions groups and explore the food system from different perspectives. Two plenary sessions open to all participants and curators introduced and concluded the dialogue. The program of our tables was as follows: -- Welcome plenary session Table 1) Biodiversity and resilience Table 2) Access to safe and nutritious food amidst rights and needs Table 3) National policies, local administrations, and civil society organizations: new alliances for local food policies Table 4) Agricultural labor, migrants, and communities Table 5) Land, credit, and grass-root level cooperation -- Concluding plenary session B) **EMBRACE MULTI-STAKEHOLDER INCLUSIVITY** Our independent dialogue involved stakeholders from different fields of expertise based on the topics discussed in each table. However, we also put a particular effort to establish new contacts between groups that generally have few opportunities to discuss, Such as national policymakers directly involved in designing development policies for inland food systems and civil local associations, cooperatives, private enterprises, professionals, and academics. NOTE: We were surprised to notice that in the excel tool provided to convenors under "Dialogue Materials" some categories of stakeholders were not listed: i.e. business networks, cooperatives, professionals, such as development consultants, agronomists, and extension services to name but a few. We find that these groups represent crucial interests to move from a value chain to a food system perspective. C) **URGENCY** Our tables were aligned to the action tracks and keywords identified by the FSS to enable each participant to directly contribute to the Summit's goals.

### DO YOU HAVE ADVICE FOR OTHER DIALOGUE CONVENORS ABOUT APPRECIATING THE PRINCIPLES OF ENGAGEMENT?

no

# 3. METHOD

---

The outcomes of a Dialogue are influenced by the method that is used.

**DID YOU USE THE SAME METHOD AS RECOMMENDED BY THE CONVENORS REFERENCE MANUAL?**

**Yes**

**No**

# 4. DIALOGUE FOCUS & OUTCOMES

## MAJOR FOCUS

Around 60% of Italy's territory is classified as inland, marginalized areas. Here, a long-lingering crisis is unfolding since the 1970s when thousands of hectares of land were abandoned due to migration. Today inland areas are home to 13 million people (about 22% of Italy's population) and 52% of its municipalities.

In 2013, the Italian government launched the National Strategy for Inner Areas (SNAI) to counteract the far-reaching implications of this crisis in the economic, social, demographic, and environmental sustainability of the country.

Inland areas are defined according to three criteria: first, essential services such as secondary schools, hospitals, and trains are on average 20 - 40 minutes distant. About 80% of Italy's inland areas have no secondary schools, forcing the youth to migrate to larger coastal cities at a very early age or to drop out of school entirely. This educational poverty thus reinforces the vicious cycle of lack of competencies, migration, unemployment, and underdevelopment.

Second, inland areas are characterized by a rich cultural and natural heritage. Apennine regions from north to south are disseminated of archaeological sites, monasteries, and historical centres. These regions also preserve most of Italy's natural capital as crucial ecological corridors for wildlife, biodiversity reserves, unique agricultural landscapes, and hydric basins.

The third characteristic of inland areas is their institutional diversity leading to several social innovations. This diversity ranges from community cooperatives to formal and informal business networks, consumers and producers' groups, unions of communes, and several models of social enterprises.

Based on participants' experiences, our dialogue focuses on the need to create synergies between national policies, local administrations, and civil society organizations.

The stories we gathered have a common thread: food is a powerful transformative force. Changing the food system means transforming culture, economic opportunities, social relations, and the natural ecosystem in a synchronic and coherent manner. We organized five tables to explore these changes across different realms.

Table 1) Biodiversity and resilience.

Natural capital is a prime resource for inland economies. This table focuses on nature-positive farming practices to preserve and value biodiversity through participatory seed selection. The table explores how these farming practices can create positive externalities and more resilient ecological systems [ACTION TRACKS 3 and 5].

Table 2) Access to safe and nutritious food amidst human rights and needs.

The top-quality food produced in the inland areas is often sold in the city for high prices. Local diets, particularly those of children, are poor and based on low-quality industrial food. This table explores how to stimulate local demand for nutritious food in the inland areas. [ACTION TRACK 1 AND 2]

Table 3) Coordination between local administrations and business networks: new alliances for local food policies.

This table concentrates on the need to create synergies to align national programs with local development projects. It identifies ways to facilitate civil society participation in the co-definition of policy objectives based on local needs [KEYWORDS FINANCING, TERRITORIAL POLICIES, INNOVATION]

Table 4) Agricultural labor, migrants, and communities.

Attracting migrants and people from the city to live in the inner areas is a priority for local development. This table focuses on the inclusion of new inhabitants in traditional inland communities through labor. What are the competencies that are needed to work today in agriculture? How changing agricultural practices can change labor and social relations in traditional communities? [ACTION TRACK 4]

Table 5) Land, credit, and grass-root level cooperation.

This table focuses on access to resources such as land and credit. Thousands of hectares have been abandoned as a result of migration, new forms of cooperation are emerging to manage land as a common. The table explores new forms of cooperatives, networks, and public-private partnerships [ACTION TRACK 4 AND 3].

### ACTION TRACKS

- ✓ Action Track 1: Ensure access to safe and nutritious food for all
- ✓ Action Track 2: Shift to sustainable consumption patterns
- ✓ Action Track 3: Boost nature-positive production
- ✓ Action Track 4: Advance equitable livelihoods
- ✓ Action Track 5: Build resilience to vulnerabilities, shocks and stress

### KEYWORDS

- |                             |                           |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------|
| ✓ Finance                   | ✓ Policy                  |
| ✓ Innovation                | Data & Evidence           |
| ✓ Human rights              | ✓ Governance              |
| ✓ Women & Youth Empowerment | Trade-offs                |
|                             | ✓ Environment and Climate |

## MAIN FINDINGS

In inner areas, more than anywhere else, food systems require a high level of coordination because:

a) smallholders cannot capture the value of biodiversity and ecosystem services; positive externalities are costs rather than added value; b) commons and public goods like open fields and traditional knowledge require community participation and institutional facilitation; c) products differentiation through labelling and certification helps capture value added, but poses entry barriers to weaker producers; d) limited skills and support services; e) small and micro enterprises lack the scale and resources to individually become change drivers.

To overcome these issues, the dialogue highlighted the need to strengthen coordination at all levels: actor-to-actor, within communities, at the territorial level, and at the wider policy level.

### 1) Enhancing coordination among food chain actors.

In inner areas, property is fragmented and soils unproductive; actor-to-actor coordination along the food chain helps achieve scale and upgrading to higher-value activities. The cases showed that, alongside traditional cooperatives, new contracts forms can respond to diverse needs (like the “network contract”). However, farmers lack the knowledge and experience to design and select the most appropriate coordination form.

Actions proposed:

Develop and disseminate toolboxes to facilitate coordination among private enterprises. Awareness campaigns and exchange of practices to revamp collective action through new instruments that reconcile private incentives with long-term coordination.

### 2) Extending coordination from the food system to the community.

Sustainable food systems also require changes in non-food sectors. Community cooperatives (CC) are an innovative coordination form to manage common goods (i.e., abandoned public land) and generate value for the community. In many cases, the CC established for a specific objective (e.g., integrating migrants) grew to manage other areas like public housing, agri-processing, marketing, training and tourism.

CCs, however, pose new challenges in communities that need to innovate, build trust, and manage conflicts when opening themselves to newcomers (migrants or new inhabitants). CCs regulations are fragmented and it is difficult to systematically monitor impacts across cases. Defining effective and equitable mechanisms for redistributing value to the community is complex.

Actions proposed:

- a) Develop coherent laws for community cooperatives at national level
- b) Define transparent principles for redistributing value added among CC members, and for monitoring and evaluation.
- c) Strengthen community management processes to support social change and manage conflicts.
- d) Develop new professional profiles like community managers or development agents, with adequate experience to facilitate community development and coordination.
- e) Support peer-to-peer learning systems to favour knowledge transfers.

### 3. Strengthening territorial coordination.

In inner areas, different administrative units operate within the same foodshed. Institutional coordination is essential to avoid duplication and overlaps between programs, and maximize synergies. Two territorial coordination mechanisms have emerged: 1) horizontal coalitions involving local institutions and administrations in the same foodshed like unions of communes, GALs (Local action groups), Comunità Montane, etc.; 2) vertical coordination aligning national programs, funding opportunities, local needs, and projects. The SNAI (National Strategy for Inner Areas) is a first attempt to coordinate inner area policies; in several cases, local institutional coordination led to successful territorial planning of policies and programs. However, not all local administrations can coordinate effectively, and the process is often difficult.

Action proposed:

- a) Strengthen the capacities of local administrations to undertake territorial policies in their foodshed. “Unions of communes” are a positive territorialization process that could be extended.
- b) Develop local administrations’ capabilities to design projects and interventions.
- c) Create dissemination tools to explain financing opportunities and facilitate planning.
- d) Engage with local communities through participatory approaches rooted in the policy process.

### 1.4 Policy coordination.

The National Strategy for Reconstruction and Resilience (NSRR) should recognize inner areas as an essential resource for the national economy. For centuries Italy has followed a diffuse urbanization model based on second-tier cities and towns surrounded by serviced foodsheds. This model can become a sustainable alternative to urban conglomerates. Technology can provide an enabling environment to spatially dislocate important productive activities and services.

Action proposed:

- a) Improve and extend place-based policies like SNAI and SIBATER
- b) Extend basic services to inner areas

### Conclusions

In addition to different coordination forms, the following recommendations also emerged:

1. Strengthen synergies between food policies and environmental policies at all levels.
2. Form new professional profiles at the national level to handle new food system processes and territorial planning. Developed curricula for agronomists specialized in agroecological contexts where industrial farming is not applicable, and

community facilitators. Similarly, for other food related expertise.  
3. Create toolkits to facilitate knowledge transfer and peer-to-peer learning.  
4. Conduct research on inland areas.

#### ACTION TRACKS

- ✓ Action Track 1: Ensure access to safe and nutritious food for all
- ✓ Action Track 2: Shift to sustainable consumption patterns
- ✓ Action Track 3: Boost nature-positive production
- ✓ Action Track 4: Advance equitable livelihoods
- ✓ Action Track 5: Build resilience to vulnerabilities, shocks and stress

#### KEYWORDS

- Finance
- ✓ Innovation
- Human rights
- ✓ Women & Youth Empowerment
- ✓ Policy
- ✓ Data & Evidence
- ✓ Governance
- Trade-offs
- ✓ Environment and Climate

## OUTCOMES FOR EACH DISCUSSION TOPIC

### ACTION TRACKS

- Action Track 1: Ensure access to safe and nutritious food for all
- Action Track 2: Shift to sustainable consumption patterns
- Action Track 3: Boost nature-positive production
- Action Track 4: Advance equitable livelihoods
- Action Track 5: Build resilience to vulnerabilities, shocks and stress

### KEYWORDS

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Finance                   | <input type="checkbox"/> Policy                  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Innovation                | <input type="checkbox"/> Data & Evidence         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Human rights              | <input type="checkbox"/> Governance              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Women & Youth Empowerment | <input type="checkbox"/> Trade-offs              |
|  | <input type="checkbox"/> Environment and Climate |



## AREAS OF DIVERGENCE

### ACTION TRACKS

- Action Track 1: Ensure access to safe and nutritious food for all
- Action Track 2: Shift to sustainable consumption patterns
- Action Track 3: Boost nature-positive production
- Action Track 4: Advance equitable livelihoods
- Action Track 5: Build resilience to vulnerabilities, shocks and stress

### KEYWORDS

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Finance                   | <input type="checkbox"/> Policy                  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Innovation                | <input type="checkbox"/> Data & Evidence         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Human rights              | <input type="checkbox"/> Governance              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Women & Youth Empowerment | <input type="checkbox"/> Trade-offs              |
|  | <input type="checkbox"/> Environment and Climate |

# CORRECTIONS, ADJUSTMENTS, OR CHANGES

Title Table Findings

Date 23/07/2021

In the following, I include the list of tables organized in our dialogue and the names of the key speakers that participated. In the attachment, there is a detailed description of our tables' findings. Table 1: on Biodiversity and Resiliency Key speakers: Sissi Alberti, Benessere Italiano; Fabrizio Antolini, Sistor; Rita Salvatore, Slow Food; Riccardo Bocci, Rete Semi Rurali; Giuseppe de Sanctis, Rete Semi Rurali; Paola Taviani, ARISAL; Miguel Acerbes, Azienda Tularù; Table 2: Access to nutritious food amidst human rights and needs. Key speakers: Tiziana Collutto (Gruppo Acquisto Popolare; Valentina Avantaggiato, Sindaco Melpignano; Davide Biolghini, Rete Italiana per l'Economia Solidale (RIES); Franca Bernardi, Comunità del Cibo della Garfagnana; Vincenzo Abbruzzese, Imprenditore agricolo; Giampaolo Cavallaro, Campagna "Cibo bene comune"; Mariagrazia Provenzano, cooperativa di comunità "I live in Vaccarizzo"; Fiorella Stella, CdLM in Scienze per la Cooperazione e lo Sviluppo; Ester Cois, Università di Cagliari; Benedetto Meloni, Università di Cagliari; Table 3) Coordination between local administrations and business networks: new alliances for local food policies. Key speakers: Daniela Storti (CREA) Gerardo Cardillo (FORMEZSIBATER) Clelia Fusco (FORMEZ) Giampiero Lupatelli (CAIRE) Mario Di Lorenzo (GAL Alto Molise) Vincenzo Viola (Regione Basilicata); Table 4: new residents and agricultural labor Key speakers: Martina Lo Cascio, Contadinazioni; Giulia Jannelli, Cooperativa Agricola di Comunità "Germinale"; Ottavio Rube, "Valli Unite"; Rosario Zurzolo, Presidente Coop. Sociale "Eurocoop Camini Jungi Mundo"; Ugo Sergi, "il Bergamotto"; Donato De Marco, Direttore Comparto Agricoltura della "Rete dei Piccoli Comuni del Welcome"; Alessandra Parisi, Università Calabria; Francesca Uleri, Università di Bolzano; Giulia Sonzognò, Officina SNAI Rete Giovani Aree Interne; Benedetto Meloni, Università di Cagliari, Donato De Marco, Consorzio Sale della Terra. Table 5: Land and cooperation: experiences from the field. Key speakers: Francesco Monaco, SIBaTer (ANCI-IFEL); Simona Elmo, SIBaTer (ANCI-IFEL); Barbara Becchi, SIBaTer Abruzzo; Lepri, Cooperativa agricola Coraggio; Gianluigi Granero, Coopfond; Tiziana Diana, Food Coop Mesa Noa; Ramona Bavassano, Food Coop Mesa Noa; Bruno Sebastianelli, Coperative "Terra e cielo"; Giuseppe Canale, Sotrie del Bio; Giovanni Battista Girolomoni, Panificio Girolomoni;

## ATTACHMENTS

- **Findings for each table**  
<https://summitdialogues.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/TableFindings.docx>

## RELEVANT LINKS

- **SNAI**  
<https://www.agenziacoesione.gov.it/strategia-nazionale-aree-interne/?lang=en>
- **SIBATER**  
<https://www.sibater.it/>
- **Riabitare l'Italia**  
[https://riabitarelitalia.net/RIABITARE\\_LITALIA/](https://riabitarelitalia.net/RIABITARE_LITALIA/)