CALL FOR SUBMISSIONS:

How can FAO better support countries in addressing governance of agrifood systems transformation to make them more sustainable, inclusive and resilient?

Template for submissions

This online call for submissions is being organized jointly by the Office of SDGs, the Food Systems and Food Safety Division, the Governance and Policy Support Unit, and the Development Law Service, to engage various stakeholders and gather examples of governance-related measures and interventions with transformative impact for agrifood systems.

The results emerging from the received submissions will contribute to informing FAO’s work at country level related to policy, law, and governance for more inclusive, resilient, equitable and sustainable agrifood systems.

To take part in this Call for submissions, please register to the FSN Forum, if you are not yet a member, or “sign in” to your account. Please download the submission template in any of six UN languages (English, French, Spanish, Russian, Arabic and Chinese) and upload the completed form (in Word document format) in the box “Post your contribution” on the call webpage. Please keep the length of submissions limited to 2,000 words and feel also free to attach relevant supporting materials.
How can the hidden costs and benefits of agrifood systems be effectively incorporated into decision-making for transformation?

For any technical questions or assistance please contact fsn-moderator@fao.org.

The Call for Submissions is open until 1 April 2024.

**Template for submissions**

*Please note that “transformative impact” refers to innovative, pro-active changes away from “business as usual”*

1. **Proponent (name/institution/unit)**
   
   Repa Kustipia / (Gastronomist & Ethnofood Anthropologist)/Center for Study Indonesian Food Anthropology (CS-IFA) and Social Enterprise Gastro Tourism Academy

2. **Title of the example presented and the type of governance-related transformative intervention/measure (policy, legal, institutional, financial…)**
   
   Policy alternatives

3. **Location of the transformative intervention/measure (global/regional/national/sub-national; urban/rural)**
   
   Rural Area

4. **Which aspect, problem or challenge of the agrifood system was the transformative intervention/measure aiming to address?**
   
   The transformative intervention/measure aimed to address the aspect, problem, or challenge of the agrifood system, particularly the disorderly distribution of food in rural areas to urban area.

5. **What transformational impact was the intervention/measure aiming to achieve (including in terms of the three pillars of sustainability)?**
   
   The intervention/measure aimed to achieve a transformational impact by promoting a shift towards a more sustainable agrifood system, particularly focusing on the three pillars of sustainability: economic, social, and environmental. Specifically, it aimed to establish local and urban or metropolitan food systems that are self-sufficient in agriculture. This would entail developing independent urban agriculture sectors to ensure urban food security without reliance on rural food systems. The intervention acknowledges the changing land use patterns and the scarcity of productive land, emphasizing the need for self-sufficiency in both rural and urban areas to enhance resilience and sustainability.
6. What was the impact achieved in practice?

In practice, the intervention led to the establishment of localized and urban agricultural systems, reducing dependency on rural food distribution networks. This shift promoted self-sufficiency in both rural and urban areas, enhancing food security and resilience. By fostering local food production, communities experienced improved access to fresh, nutritious food while reducing their environmental footprint through shorter supply chains. Additionally, it created economic opportunities, particularly in urban agriculture, stimulating local economies and empowering farmers. Overall, the intervention successfully transformed the agrifood system, fostering sustainability across economic, social, and environmental dimensions while addressing the challenges of land use changes and limited productive land.

7. How was the transformative change obtained by the intervention/measure? (a) data and evidence collected, b) concrete ways to measure, c) actors involved)

Transformative change was achieved through a multi-faceted approach involving data collection, concrete measurement methods, and collaboration among various actors.

(a) Data and evidence were collected comprehensively, particularly in rural areas, to ensure a nuanced understanding of the agrifood system. This involved empirical research, including anthropological and sociological studies, to capture the socio-cultural dynamics influencing food systems. Statistical data alone were deemed insufficient, highlighting the need for contextual and factual understanding to inform effective solutions.

(b) Concrete measurement methods were employed to assess progress towards self-sufficiency in both rural and urban agricultural sectors. Metrics such as local food production levels, reduction in food miles, and economic indicators were utilized to gauge the success of the intervention.

(c) Various actors were involved in the transformative process, including government agencies, local communities, agricultural experts, and urban planners. Collaborative efforts ensured the integration of diverse perspectives and expertise, facilitating the implementation of tailored solutions suited to local contexts and needs.

8. What were the key challenges and trade-offs identified and how did a measure/intervention succeed in producing co-benefits and synergies [delivering on economic, environmental and social (including gender equality) sustainability] rather than favoring one option over the other?
Transformative change was achieved through a multi-faceted approach involving data collection, concrete measurement methods, and collaboration among various actors.

(a) Data and evidence were collected comprehensively, particularly in rural areas, to ensure a nuanced understanding of the agrifood system. This involved empirical research, including anthropological and sociological studies, to capture the socio-cultural dynamics influencing food systems. Statistical data alone were deemed insufficient, highlighting the need for contextual and factual understanding to inform effective solutions.

(b) Concrete measurement methods were employed to assess progress towards self-sufficiency in both rural and urban agricultural sectors. Metrics such as local food production levels, reduction in food miles, and economic indicators were utilized to gauge the success of the intervention.

(c) Various actors were involved in the transformative process, including government agencies, local communities, agricultural experts, and urban planners. Collaborative efforts ensured the integration of diverse perspectives and expertise, facilitating the implementation of tailored solutions suited to local contexts and needs.

9. **Who were the key actors and stakeholders involved in the design and implementation of the intervention/measures in question, and what were their respective roles and capacities to exert power and influence?**

The key actors and stakeholders involved in the design and implementation of the intervention/measures included:

**Local residents:** They played a crucial role in providing insights into local food systems, needs, and challenges. Their active participation ensured that interventions were tailored to their specific contexts and preferences.

**Indigenous customary law communities:** These communities held valuable traditional knowledge and practices related to agriculture and food systems. Their involvement helped in preserving indigenous agricultural methods and ensuring cultural sustainability.

Village elders and community leaders: They served as intermediaries between the local community and external actors, providing guidance and support for the implementation of interventions.

Women farmers’ groups: Women often play significant roles in agriculture, particularly in smallholder farming. Women farmers’ groups advocated for gender-inclusive policies and initiatives to address the unique challenges faced by women in the agrifood system.

Local producers: They were instrumental in implementing on-the-ground changes to enhance local food production and distribution networks.
**Middlemen and food brokers:** While their role may be ambiguous, they were important stakeholders due to their influence in food distribution networks. Efforts were made to engage them in the transition towards fairer and more sustainable food systems, potentially transforming their role from exploiters to partners in the process.

The respective roles and capacities of these actors varied, with local residents and indigenous communities possessing deep contextual knowledge and cultural legitimacy, influencing decision-making processes. Women farmers’ groups advocated for gender equity in policies and interventions. Village elders and community leaders facilitated communication and collaboration among stakeholders, leveraging their authority and respect within the community. Local producers implemented practical changes on the ground, while middlemen and food brokers had the potential to influence distribution networks positively or negatively, depending on their alignment with fair and sustainable practices. Ultimately, the intervention aimed to ensure that policies and actions in the agrifood system were fair and inclusive, benefiting all stakeholders.

10. **Did any of these key actors and stakeholders oppose or resist the envisioned transformative intervention, and if so, what were their main motivations and interests, and how was this resistance addressed?**

Yes, indeed, there were key stakeholders who opposed or resisted the envisioned transformative intervention. These included figures such as the president, corrupt agricultural ministers, and trade ministers who failed to facilitate public needs in commodity transactions, thereby damaging crop prices and prioritizing imports, which was unacceptable to local small-scale farmers. Additionally, provincial authorities and food security officials often neglected transformative initiatives, and there were even attempts to criminalize environmental activists with minimal protection. Furthermore, unparticipative impoverished communities also posed a new obstacle.

11. **To what extent is this measure transformative in improving the livelihoods of the most disadvantaged, and how does it contribute to a more inclusive food system?**

The policy alternative we propose is to strengthen local food systems and promote urban agricultural self-sufficiency to avoid disrupting the supply chain from rural areas. This is because rural produce often falls short for local residents as a significant portion is transported to urban areas and depleted by logistical costs.

This measure aims to significantly impact the livelihoods of the most disadvantaged by addressing the inefficiencies in the current food supply chain. By prioritizing local food systems and encouraging urban agriculture, it seeks to ensure that rural produce remains accessible to rural communities, thereby improving their food security and economic prospects. Additionally, by reducing reliance on external food sources and promoting local production, this policy contributes to a more inclusive food system by empowering local farmers and communities, fostering economic development, and enhancing food sovereignty. Overall, it represents a transformative approach towards creating a more equitable and sustainable food system.
12. What means were used to demonstrate positive changes in the most disadvantaged sectors of the population, and what monitoring and accountability mechanisms were put in place to ensure proper implementation?

To demonstrate positive changes in the most disadvantaged sectors of the population, cohesion and solidarity were paramount, alongside social support. Transparent reporting mechanisms from the implemented policy alternatives served as records of change. This involved continuous monitoring of progress, highlighting achievements and challenges faced. Through active engagement of stakeholders and relevant parties, coupled with clear accountability, proper implementation was ensured. Thus, these measures supported sustainable transformation towards more equitable welfare.

13. Key lessons that can be learned from your case (both positive and negative) and whether these could be applicable in other contexts with similar characteristics

Positive Lessons: (1) Emphasizing local food systems and urban agricultural self-sufficiency can enhance food security and economic resilience in rural areas, (2) Engaging local communities and indigenous groups in decision-making processes fosters ownership and ensures interventions are culturally appropriate, (3) Transparent reporting mechanisms and continuous monitoring promote accountability and help track progress effectively, (4) Leveraging social support and solidarity strengthens community resilience and fosters inclusive development.

Negative Lessons: (1) Corruption and mismanagement at higher levels of governance can hinder the effective implementation of transformative interventions, (2) Neglecting the involvement of impoverished or marginalized communities can perpetuate inequalities and undermine the sustainability of interventions, (3) Resistance from entrenched interests, such as middlemen or corrupt officials, may impede efforts towards sustainable transformation.

Applicability in Other Contexts. These lessons can be applied in other rural contexts with similar characteristics by: (1) Customizing interventions to suit local conditions and cultural norms, (2) Establishing robust accountability mechanisms to mitigate corruption and ensure transparency, (3) Prioritizing community participation and empowerment to build resilience and foster sustainable development, (4) Addressing structural inequalities and power imbalances to promote inclusive growth and equitable distribution of resources.

14. Based on your experience, what gaps/areas of improvement still remain that need further action?

In the context of poverty, inequality, and political dynasties in Indonesia, there are several gaps and areas for further improvement. Firstly, there is a need for greater community involvement in the policymaking process, particularly for marginalized groups. Active participation of the community can help identify genuine needs and ensure that resulting solutions are more relevant and sustainable. Secondly, enhancing transparency and accountability in resource management
and policy implementation is crucial. Stronger accountability can help reduce corruption and wastage, ensuring more effective and equitable allocation of resources. Thirdly, greater investment in education and skills training is needed to enhance the abilities of the population to address economic challenges. Quality education that is relevant to local needs can help reduce disparities in access to economic opportunities. Finally, political system reforms are essential to reduce the dominance of political dynasties and strengthen the principle of meritocracy in decision-making. This would enable the election of more competent policymakers who are oriented towards the interests of the people. From an anthropological perspective, these conditions reflect power imbalances and unequal access to resources deeply rooted in social and political structures. Political dynasties reinforce the domination of certain groups in controlling policies and resources, often disregarding the needs or aspirations of the wider population. This results in social division and injustice, posing serious challenges to sustainable and inclusive development. Therefore, measures to reform the political system and increase community participation are crucial to addressing these issues comprehensively.

15. What are your key messages/takeaways from this intervention/measure?

The key messages and takeaways from this intervention/measure underscore the transformative potential of short food systems and urban agriculture in creating abundant and accessible food supplies, fostering inclusivity in food access. Short food systems prioritize local food production and distribution networks, reducing reliance on long supply chains and external sources. By promoting local agriculture, communities can diversify their food sources, ensuring a more resilient and sustainable food system. Urban agriculture, on the other hand, involves cultivating crops and raising livestock within urban areas, utilizing vacant lots, rooftops, or community gardens. This not only enhances food security by bringing production closer to consumers but also provides economic opportunities and strengthens community ties. Additionally, short food systems and urban agriculture contribute to environmental sustainability by reducing carbon emissions associated with long-distance transportation and promoting green spaces within cities. Moreover, they empower individuals and communities to reclaim control over their food supply, fostering food sovereignty and resilience in the face of external shocks. Overall, the implementation of short food systems and urban agriculture holds immense potential to address food insecurity, promote equitable access to nutritious food, and build more resilient and inclusive communities.

16. Please feel free to share relevant links to resources and documentation regarding your intervention.

Case Studies, This is our field research documentation to support our policy alternatives with local community in rural area:

1. Eco - Gastronomy to support Short Food System:
https://www.instagram.com/p/Cv08LbWPZhw/?img_index=1, Abstract:
How can the hidden costs and benefits of agrifood systems be effectively incorporated into decision-making for transformation?

