

**PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS: ENDING HUNGER AND MALNUTRITION
THROUGH COLLABORATION**

Panel Moderator: *Peter Robinson*
October 19, 2019 - 10:20 a.m.

Introduction

Ambassador Kenneth M. Quinn

President - World Food Prize Foundation

So our next panel, I want to express a word of appreciation in introducing them. First to Mike Mitchner. Mike, are you there? There's Mike over there. What a wonderful friend, as this panel was his initiative in bringing it up. Thank you so very, very much. And I want to thank John and Janis Ruan, who are here, because we had, in hoping to set up the panel, have Governor Hickenlooper and Governor Kasich come. And we thought, well, neither are going to make it. But John and Janis went to Colorado. They were at an event with the governor. They mentioned the World Food Prize, and the next thing I knew I was getting a message from a member of your staff, and my goodness, we're so pleased that you're here, Governor, and of course Hickenlooper is a well-known name in Iowa for Senator Hickenlooper. So somewhere in the DNA he had Republican DNA and I know you have Democratic DNA.

But I now want to turn it over to Peter Robinson, the CEO and President of U.S. Council for International Business, and you'll introduce the other members of the panel. Thank you all so much for being here. Over to you.

Panel Members

Ellen de Brabander	R&D SVP Global Functions, Governance & Compliance, Research and Development, PepsiCo
Lawrence Haddad	2018 World Food Prize Laureate & Executive Director, Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition (GAIN)
Hon. John Hickenlooper	Governor of the State of Colorado, United States
Jane Nelson	Director of the Corporate Responsibility Initiative, Harvard's Kennedy School of Government

Panel Moderator

Peter Robinson

President & CEO, U.S. Council for International Business

Ken, thanks so much for that introduction, and thanks to you and the World Food Prize for having us here today and for allowing us to put on this panel with how we can use public-private partnerships to help further the nutrition goals.

Obviously, I'm very honored to be moderator of a very distinguished panel. I'm humbled to do it. As you can see, we have somebody who needs no introduction: our laureate, Lawrence Haddad. And, Lawrence, what a wonderful event last night, and congratulations to you.

We've got the leader of the great state of Colorado, Governor John Hickenlooper; Pepsico's Senior Vice President for Global Functions, Governance and Compliance and Research and Development-is that all? - Dr. Ellen de Brabander, and Jane Nelson of the Brookings Institute and also Director of the Corporate Responsibility Initiative at the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard.

Let me just tell you a little bit about where I'm coming from and my organization, the U.S. Council for International Business. USCIB is primarily a policy advocacy organization working to represent American companies doing business internationally. We support open markets and the business voice in global public policy and regulations. And that's facilitated by the fact that we serve as the American affiliate of several global business organizations, including the International Chamber of Commerce, the International Organization of Employers, and Business at the OECD. We've been involved in representing private sector views to the United Nations since 1945 and the Sustainable Development Goals even before their inception in 2015. In fact, we maintain a recognized SDG website called Businessfor2030.org, that among other things provides case studies of what leading international companies are doing, not only philanthropically but as part of their actual business operations and strategy to help achieve the 17 SDGs.

We have been looking for ways to improve and accelerate business engagement in the implementation of the global nutrition goals, which we believe is absolutely essential if we hope to achieve these goals by 2030. One of the barriers that we have found in addressing this issue is the lack of clear and generally understood and accepted parameters to establish public-private partnerships. Another barrier was, as Liam Condon was talking about yesterday, a certain lack of trust in business these days. And we have been dealing with that actually in a context of today's discussion with the food and beverage industry.

So we entered into a partnership with Lawrence's organization, the Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition (GAIN) to see if we could do something to help overcome these barriers. And that started with an initial dialog in New York one year ago involving the USCIB Foundation, and we came up with seven principles of engagement to hopefully help encourage these kinds of partnerships that will improve nutritional outcomes.

And Lawrence and I launched the principles—which are: alignment, prioritization, impact data, innovation, accountability and inclusion—just a couple of months ago in Geneva, in June actually. And one week later we find out that Lawrence has won the World Food Prize, so there was an opportunity to bring the dialog here to Des Moines today.

We're going to have our second dialog on how to implement these principles in Rome in just a few weeks, to bring the U.N. food and agriculture community into the discussion, and we'll talk more about that later in the panel.

So to close up for now, I just would refer back also to Robb Fraley's comments yesterday that there's never been as much technology available as there is today to address the challenges that we have in the food and nutrition area. So the challenge that we all face is – How can we leverage that technology for good purposes? How can we leverage it to implement what we need to do to achieve our goals?

So let's start off. I'd like to start off with Jane. Jane, you have a lot of focus on governance and accountability and business and international development. So I was thinking that your work makes you well-suited to help frame our conversation today about how cross-sector partnerships can help to create social responsibility and improve nutritional outcomes.

Jane Thanks, Peter, and good morning, everyone. It's absolutely wonderful to be here as part of such a collegial but also action-oriented and collaborative community of doers and change-makers. And I think one of the things that's most inspired me in the last few days is just example after example of new types of partnerships that are emerging between government and business and civil society and the academic community.

And I think it's fair to say, after working in the field of building partnerships for almost a quarter of a century now, I think it's fair to say that in the last decade we've seen a lot of advance in terms of new levels of trust and increase of shared understanding and mutual accountability when it comes to building partnerships. But we've still got a really long way to go. And I think as we've heard again and again in the last few days, we're simply not moving at either the speed or the scale that we need to move at to end hunger and malnutrition or meet many of the Sustainable Development Goals.

And we also heard again and again in partnership here, that's one of the key pathways forward. And I think it's useful to distinguish. I certainly distinguish between sort of at least two levels of partnership. They are the- what I call project-based operational delivery partnerships where a government entity or a company or an NGO or an academic institution work together on the ground. And we've got hundreds of those, we need thousands more of those, so the project-level partnerships. But I think what we really need to up our game on and rise to the challenge on is what I would call system-level coalitions or platforms or multi-stakeholder partnerships where your groups of the ministries at the national level or groups of governments, groups of companies, groups of NGOs, come together collectively to try and shift an entire commodity value chain or influence the food system, water at a much more system level.

And I think very, very quickly there are three types of partnerships at the system level that I think are really important. And the first is coalitions to mobilize substantially more innovation and investment in new technologies, new business models, new products and services, and doing it, as I say, at a system level. So a great example would be Feed the Future. I think the great thing about Feed the Future is that you have got requirements and commitments from government, it's

got commitments from business, it's got commitments from donors. It's engaged farmers' organizations. And together have developed this shared vision and mission and commitments and then individually all the players can go and do what they're doing operationally. So, great example that's mobilized hundreds of millions of dollars and innovation for development. The Global Alliance to improve nutrition itself is a great example, which Lawrence will be able to talk about. But just this week in Nairobi they've hosted the Africa Nutrition Investor Conference. And all together investors from all types of investment agencies with businesses to literally create deals on nutritious value chains. So that's at one level, so these coalitions to substantially increase innovation and investment.

I think the second type of coalition we need are coalitions to develop and spread responsible practices, responsible social and environmental practices, which are holding both business and government in particular to account. And I think we're particularly going to need that with all the new technologies. They offer so much potential, but how do we make sure that the new technologies don't have negative impacts and build the trust that's needed so those new technologies can be dispersed by having standards or the types of principles that you're developing.

And then third and I think also very importantly are coalitions around advocacy and advocacy both sort of public policy advocacy but also raising public awareness on the importance of nutrition and tackling hunger and malnutrition and partnerships to change consumer behavior. I think we're seeing some great examples now. The U.S. Global Leadership Coalition that was here two days ago. What a brilliant example of business, civil society, the ministry coming together to not just challenge government but work with government to be the best they can be on international development.

And I would like to see – what does that look at the national level around hunger and malnutrition and the scaling up? And the nutrition movement is doing that, but how do we then much more active at the national level with coalitions of business, civil society coming together to help government both develop but also implement policies that much more supportive to tackle hunger and malnutrition and to raise consumer awareness and public awareness of how important it is. And to harness the incredible marketing capabilities of business, the platforms that business can offer to advocate to end hunger and malnutrition.

So those are three: mobilizing more investment in innovation, establishing and spreading responsible standards and norms, and then thirdly joining together for public advocacy to end hunger and malnutrition.

Peter I knew you would be able to frame our conversation very well. That's kind of an inspiring blueprint for moving forward. Thank you. Governor, maybe you could give us some perspectives from the public sector, although you do come from the private sector originally. So you have that perspective and experience and I know that you've done a number of initiatives in Colorado including the Colorado Fresh Food Financing Fund. So perhaps you'd give some perspectives on your transition from the private sector to the public sector and how we can move forward with partnerships or I guess as you call it in Denver, collaboration.

John Sure, and I want to thank the Ruans and all the sponsors for putting this together, because I've admired this from a distance for a long time. And I can't express, it's just a great honor to be here. And my father's cousin, my father's first cousin was Bourke Hickenlooper, who was admittedly Republican, but, you know, we can't have all these things balance out.

So I spent 15 years in the restaurant business, so I looked at food from that point of view, and I thought what I would do is take two different places where we found different types of collaboration in resolving conflict in Colorado that aren't food-based and then apply it to food a little bit. And John Kasich couldn't come, but you should think of me as speaking both for myself and for John Kasich. He might not agree with that everything I said, but he would give me the latitude to express it. And he does the same with me from time to time.

The first thing I'd say is in terms of health care, when John Kasich and I both came together almost two years ago, we recognized that expanding Medicaid coverage, making sure that you can argue about how much coverage someone gets but that everybody should have some basic level of health coverage was a fact that most people bought into. And yet politically in Washington it had broken down into blue versus red, Republican versus Democrat. And so we rolled up our sleeves and I think demonstrated that we could resolve... And we disagree on many things, but we could find compromises and move forward on how to create an improved Affordable Care Act without throwing the baby out with the bath water. And I think we made a lot of progress, and I think we convinced a number of people, including the late John McCain that we should preserve and improve the system rather than starting all over again.

The second thing I'll talk about is in Colorado, we're the top five states for oil and gas, so it's a very volatile relationship between the environmental and community-owned gas industry. They hate each other. I would say they're almost as much animosity as between Coke and Pepsi, but I have the senior vice president from Pepsi here, so I'm going to pass beyond that. But we sat down. There's a guy named Fred Krupp, who I met at a meeting in Switzerland, my gosh, almost eight years ago now. And he said, "Well, one thing you've got to do is go to those oil and gas guys and fugitive emissions. Leaking methane is 60 times worse as a climate change gas than anything that CO₂ can do. And they've got to step up." And I said, "Well, I just got elected. Not sure that's gonna happen."

Three months later I had the CEO of the largest operator in Colorado in my office, and I just kind of through out there, "Well, at some point you're gonna have to do something about methane." And like that, he looked at me and he said, "Well, if we did something, you guys would make a lot of red tape, a lot of money would be wasted. It wouldn't really make the air cleaner, and we wouldn't get any credit." And so we spent an hour negotiating those three points. I went to the environmental community, back to Fred Krupp, who was surprised to get my call, and basically we spent, we got the environmental community, the Environmental Defense Fund, the Colorado Environmental Coalition put their scientists together with scientists from the oil and gas industry. And they spent two months fighting about the science, the research papers, if you know something about how this works. But once they got those compromises done, they rolled up their sleeves.

They spent another 12 months, and we created the first set of methane regulations in the United States.

Our methane regulations are being rolled out in Canada now for the entire country of Canada. It proves that you can in the end, not create red tape, not create bureaucracy – you can keep business at the table and yet do a dramatic public good. The oil and gas industry agreed to spend \$60 million a year to inspect and make sure that there was essentially almost no fugitive emissions. And in so doing, they created the equivalent of taking 320,000 automobiles off the roads. So that's a second example, I would say.

And then in terms of food, we look at food waste, which is obviously endemic in this country. We had a guy named Massimo Bottura who's, I think he's considered this year the top chef in the world – I'm not sure who decides that. But he's building a facility in Colorado to take all the food waste from the convention center, from the large catering companies, and make sure that food gets recycled and reused. We have in Colorado one out of ten people have some level of food uncertainty. One out of seven kids don't know where their food's going to come from. And I think there are ways that we can, again with public-private partnerships, government is helping support that, but it's really businesses coming together with Massimo and seem to make sure that that is addressed aggressively.

The other big battle in food – and there was some protestors out, I know, yesterday – that the issues around the two systems, right? There's the organic farmers, the larger, more at-scale farmers and producers of food and various foodstuffs. That battle has gotten to be so destructive... And if you think about it, what we did with the oil and gas industry and what we did in the health care situation was really go to the other side and listen. And without trust you're never going to be able to get the compromises. Unless people begin to have some relationship of trust, you'll never collaborate. In Colorado we like to say that *we collaborate at the speed of trust*. And I think that's the real opportunity to look at where are those places of common ground?

I spent the last year and a half talking to the organic side and the large-scale, commercial side or the larger-scale commercial side. And it's interesting – both sides care deeply about soil quality. And I think that's a tremendous opportunity to look at – how do we put regenerative..., put more carbon back into the soil? That helps climate change in itself; it reduces nitrogen going in as a climate pollution. It has a lot of benefits. It allows farmers to control costs, because we know that only 40% of the nutrients are really needed in fertilizer get utilized; a lot of that gets flung off. So the fertilizer fluctuates wildly based on the price of oil. It allows farmers to control the costs but also improves the quality of their water. And I haven't met a farmer yet who doesn't care passionately about the quality of water around him.

And I think finding those places where we can sit down with both sides and provide incentives – right? Why isn't government on a... We're trying to do this on a state basis, but I think on a national level, how do we provide incentives for more markets to purchase crop covers – right? That's the best way, one of the best ways to do regenerative farming. But there's got to be a way that... You know, farmers

are in many cases struggling to put that extra dollar into their soil, even the World Bank says we've only got 60 years of soil left. We all have to agree on the urgency, but we have to provide incentives and financial incentives that bring together again public and private sides to make sure that we do those additional benefits.

And once you begin looking at the people that are getting involved, Walmart, which is now the largest grocer in the United States, came out a few years ago saying they were going to push regenerative, sustainable plants and meats. They have now in 2017 they came out and their goal was to look at—how can they get at-scale the farmers to do sustainable farming? And they looked at it again just through costs and how do you, when you look at the quality of soil and making sure that you're using regenerative approaches, that they're trying to find ways that that pays for itself.

And we're beginning to see the results. The Perdue chicken came out a few weeks ago and said that they're going to in the next couple of years reduce the cost of organic chicken by 50%. And so I think the key here is to find, again in that sense of creating trust, getting both sides and creating... Government can play an active role in getting both sides to the table and a neutral environment where you can begin to rebuild that trust that has been broken down.

Peter Thanks very much, Governor. I love the phrase, "Collaborate at the speed of trust." In our world, my organization's world of international organizations, I'd love for some of the heads of those organizations these days to hear your message. We've found that these days there is a rallying cry that there is a supposed conflict of interest and some kind of an inherent conflict of interest with business, which I think is unfounded, but it's there because of a lack of trust and a lack of people sitting down at the same table and being able to understand each other's commitments and motivations and potential, I think. So thank you.

PepsiCo is one of USCIB's very active members and leaders, including in the food and ag area. And we're delighted to have its Senior Vice President for Research and Development with us today. And Ellen, maybe you could tell us a little bit about from the private sector point of view some of the way that Pepsi is approaching this issue and some of the partnerships you've putting into play either here in the United States or in Europe.

Ellen Absolutely. Thanks for the opportunity. I'm happy to do so. Clearly, public-private partnerships is a topic that is very close to my heart already for a number of years. I'm from Europe originally, and I would like to share some of my experience from that time as well.

But let me focus a little bit on PepsiCo first. So why actually is this of interest for us? Clearly as a leading food and beverage player in the U.S. and a number two global, we have a role to play in feeding the world. And it's also very clear that we are changing our focus from just feeding. Every day more, 1.3 billion consumers somewhere consume our products from PepsiCo, so that is an important responsibility. But it clearly moved to the next level. As we say, we added two additional dimensions, the dimension of nutrition and the dimension of sustainability.

So it very much impacts the way we work, and it impacts both our current portfolio where we have and still are putting in a tremendous amount of effort to kind of clean up the current portfolio, reduce sugar, saturated fat, salt. And so all of that certainly have made very clear commitments to achieve drastic reductions in each of those by 2025. And we are making progress as we speak and as you will see around you if you consume the products.

But we really go beyond that. It's also adding more of the positive nutrition. You may have seen that we have clearly focused on growing that part of the portfolio faster than the beverage in this next portfolio, adding more fruits and vegetables, whole grains, via the Quaker portfolio, protein So that's a lot of additional focus.

But even I would say beyond the transformation of the portfolio, clearly there is the sustainability dimension. We all have seen what happened in the field of package change. Clearly we are very much involved in that, what can we do, and step up how to reduce the impact of packaging from both beverages as well as from this next portfolio there.

And so with all of that in mind, it is clear that the way we do R&D in PepsiCo is very different from the way we did it in the past. It's also very clear that we cannot do it on our own. We need so many different expertise and capabilities that no way that we are even willing or wanting or desiring to build that internally. So we have absolutely stepped up our involvement with external partners for the last decade, I would say and especially the last couple years that we really did go much further. You may have seen a couple of the announcements, especially in the packaging field where we did step up and join the coalitions to basically come up with our recyclable PET bottles for the beverage part or use bio-based monomers or hydrolyzed PET bottles.

So we have a number of coalitions together with these other partners, very much focused almost on mission-driven coalitions and including different partners, including also competitors. So that is actually a nice way that we are doing it there.

But what I'd like to zoom in today is another consortium, and that is a European consortium called EIT Food, European Institute for Technology and is the focus on food. And maybe one step back, it was in 2008 where there was the crisis in Europe, and Europe wanted to really invest public money to boost innovation and create valuable jobs by also creating new public-private partnerships by the name. EIT Food was really referring back to MIT. Europe wanted to have its own MIT and called it European Institute of Technology. In the end after a lot of debate, it was basically done in a very different way. It was only in a virtual way and not a physical institute.

But anyway what happened is that a number of areas were identified where the public wanted to gather these private partners and academic partners would work together. Clearly, the first three were digital, energy, IT, you know, all fields where you can explain to the consumer – yes, we use tax money to really invest and boost them. And the good news actually was that in 2015 for the first time food was a priority in Europe. That in itself was already a milestone, because it never happens in the last decade. But food was a priority at the European level. So it was never

European innovation money, or research money, only very little. It was all the other sectors were much more capable of getting aligned and getting their act together to basically also benefit from the European.

So finally in 2015, yes. Food was never seen as a priority and the different organizations were asked to submit their bids for the new public-private partnership in the food arena. And I was actually leading that coalition that in the end did get the winning bid because only one would be approved, and that was the one that I was leading in the interim on top of my PepsiCo role.

And if you look at it from a distance, you might say, well, this is almost it sounds like paradise, you know. And I can tell you it's not, but from a distance... Because in the end what happens is there is that commitment, the seven-year commitment of working together with 50 partners that were some lessons were learned. And we said, let's not go to more than 50 partners, so let's cap it at 50 partners. So we have 50 partners from academic, from industry, new international, smaller ones covering all of Europe, covering the entire value chain. We have partners including PepsiCo, also from outside Europe, but that was okay. Nestlé was there but also a leading university. So it was all working together, capable and committed members, the family there for a longer term. Still now we are a couple years on its way, and there are clearly a couple lessons to be learned. And for future partnerships let's not overlook that spot.

So one lesson to be learned is clearly the complexity. The more members are involved in a partnership, then exponentially the complexity will go up and especially if you link that to governmental, to public funding; because you have to be compliant with all the European and the national and the regional guardrails. And then on top of that you have the individual agendas still of members. I did not tell, but the funding of this initiative is 1.5 billion euros, so it is significant, 1.5 billion euro. I don't think there's any other food-related public-private partnership with a similar amount of funding. So that all was there. But indeed the complexity is almost killing despite all good intents, because no one wants this complexity. It was really only from the start about the idea we are going to do this different, right, and, you know, all the words that apply there.

The other key lesson is – it's okay that you have organizations committed, but it is even more important that you have the commitment from the top. What's not working if you have local researchers there and people move jobs, because in the end what you end up is just a collection of ideas, collection of projects approved. But I did not say this whole public-private partnership is focusing basically on three dimensions.

One is innovation, so research done together as partners that really should result in new products. Second is education, not only of the students but also of the small and medium companies and also of the public. And the third one is really boosting new startups. So those are the three areas. That's where the money will be used for.

But indeed that complexity and the commitment, the longer-term commitment of the members are two of those lessons where I say, now, if that's not in place and if you're not able to manage that complexity, still it is not able to deliver what it

actually was supposed to deliver. And I could not agree more in terms of the need to really form those coalitions, to scale up and go beyond individual projects to really speed up and accelerate the impact of this, in itself, very powerful partnership.

Peter Ellen, thank you so much—demonstrating in a few short minutes, that PepsiCo is obviously at the cutting edge and leading edge of public-private partnerships, and you obviously have a lot of examples and advice and counsel for the rests of us, I think, as we try to move forward.

Now, to the man of the hour or of the year. Lawrence, it's been an honor to work with you and GAIN over the past year on developing the principles. Our project had been called "No More Missed Opportunities" because it was reflecting on the fact that we believe that there were missed opportunities from the public and private sectors not collaborating more. We're calling it now, "Together for Nutrition." But could you give some examples and your vision of why partnerships are important to GAIN in terms of pursuing nutrition goals around the world and maybe also some thoughts about how we can bring our partnership forward?

Lawrence Sure, Peter. Thank you so much. I thought I would talk a little bit about why it's important to engage with business and then just run through, use the principles to sort of illustrate some of the, I think, still tricky negotiations and contestations we have to navigate collectively, if that's okay.

So the Sustainable Development Goals expect and actually obligate all parts of society to come together to advance those goals and SDG 2, for food and nutrition, is no different. A lot of people, actually a smaller and smaller number of people, will say business has no business in being involved in this food and nutrition area. But they're not living in the real world, because as data from the World Bank show, most people, the vast majority of people, even in rural Ethiopia, acquire their food from markets. And so that means the private sector is involved. So we can either say, well, we think the private sector is terrible and we're going to ignore them—that won't be very productive—or we can say, yes, sometimes they're a part of the problem, in fact quite often they're a part of the problem, but if we're going to get to SDG 2, they have to become a bigger part of the solution. So to me, that's just, I'm afraid, a no-brainer.

The question is, however, how do we engage—under which conditions, with which companies, which sectors, for which groups, and at which points in time? And I think this is where this partnership with USCIB Foundation, which was brokered nicely by our colleague, Leath Greenslade, JustActions, has been really useful. So it's come up with seven principles. Now, you can kind of roll your eyes and say, well, they're just principles—so what? But I think for us they're starting points on this journey of setting norms, setting expectations around—what is a responsible way of engaging? We hope that will evolve into something more. We hope they will influence others. We hope we will be able to live up to them ourselves. But let me just run through them, because I think Peter has already mentioned them, but I think that each one illustrates kind of a kernel of an issue that we have to deal with.

The first one is *alignment*. So governments clearly have to set the priorities. They are the accountable body for their citizens. They have to set the priorities, but that doesn't mean they can't listen to all corners of society. So that's the first thing. I think the more important thing is that we host a lot of... GAIN, and the World Food Program co-host the SUN business network, and these are national networks as well as a global network. And I've attended many of the national networks, and it's extraordinary how little businesses understand the priorities of the government and how little the government understands what businesses can do. Many governments think of businesses as money trees, but they're not that, but they're much more than that, actually. So I think there's a lot to do around alignment.

Prioritization. Food systems, malnutrition in all its forms, these are complicated things. So even if you have a national nutrition plan or a food system plan and you're pretty clear about what you want to do, where do you start? You've got to start in the right place. That might not be in the place that's dictated to by the technical realities or the technical needs. It may be where the politics is or where the capacity is. And so you need a way of prioritizing where to start and who to start with, and at GAIN we are developing these tools with MSU and Johns Hopkins and a couple of private sector companies to do that.

Impact is the third one, and I can't tell you how many panels I've been on like this where someone from a business, from a corporation will say, "We are doing fantastic stuff in nutrition." And I'll say afterwards in the Green Room or the coffee, "That sounds great. Tell me, where can I find out about it?" And they'll say, "Go to the website." They give me a link. I go to the website. There's a two-page document that summarizes it. It's basically PR. There's no technical document that I can go and refer to, to say, did this work, is it working? I don't really care how you define if it's working (and I do), but the first thing is – Have you actually got a technical, independently reviewed document that tells me if it's working or not. So I think impact is really important, and all the work we do with our private sector companies, we spend a lot of resources commissioning others to do impact of our work. And I think that's a really important principle. It's difficult, though. A number of the programs that we do at GAIN with the private sector, there are a number of different impact outcomes. There is the number of servings that are brought to market. There's the amount of private sector funding that's liberated. There's a price point, because price point is obviously very important. There is consumption outcomes. There is profit, because it has to be profitable if it's going to be sustained. And all of these are sort of a dashboard of indicators, and there's a real debate there about, you know – how do you weigh these indicators of profit against each other. So impact is a very important part of this.

Data is the fourth point, very important. There's lots of... The private sector has a ton of data on consumption in particular; it's very granular and very useful and important. And the public sector can't get it. The public sector has a lot of data that is actually very expansive, maybe not as granular, but it's not, it's never – what's the word I'm looking for? – curated in a way that makes it easy for the private sector to use. So there's a big set of opportunities around data, and actually we're working with URAM on it to try to get URAM on it to go into low-income countries

that collect lots of retail purchase data. They're already operate in high-income and middle-income companies. So there's lots of opportunities there.

Innovation. Companies, as you heard from our colleagues, companies spend billions of dollars on innovation, billions of dollars. How much of that is duplicative or competitive? How much of that is directed towards nutrition, food and health concerns? I don't know, but I do know that there's a lot of pre-competitive research that could be done that's valuable for all companies in a certain sector and is valuable for all public sector organizations as well. So we need more mechanisms to support pre-competitive public-private research that's valuable for everybody. And still on innovation, there are lots of innovations going on outside of the food system in the private sector sphere and in the public sector, but a lot in the private sector, that we need to bring into the food sector. And someone mentioned block chain, and that's kind of the... You know, not many of us really understand it. I don't really understand it, but we need to talk with the people who really understand it, to tell us how we can use it for, yes, food safety, yes, food provenance but also nutrition and health. And I don't think we know that, so innovation is a key thing.

Accountability is very important for trust – that's the sixth one. I think the Governor mentioned partnerships and action and impact moves as fast as the speed of trust. And I completely agree with that. And the way to build accountability is to say – What are you going to do? And did you do it? It's not much more complicated than that, really. And we're big fans of things like the Access to Nutrition Index, which was hot-housed at GAIN before it became an independent foundation. And that's great, and it has moved the needle on the compass. I talk to companies that are really concerned about where they are in that ranking, that ATNI ranking and what they're doing. And they're really proud. I was talking to a couple of senior people at Kellogg, and they were very proud because they'd jumped up a lot between the 2016 and 2018 global report. So these things matter. But we need to get those kinds of things at the national level too with the medium and large national companies, because there's so much, so much happening. The big food companies account for about 15% of all food sales. It's not like the big soft drink manufacturers who account for about 50, I think. So there's a lot of private sector action in the food area that comes outside of the 15 or the big food companies, and we need to pay more attention to them.

Finally, *inclusion*, which is number seven, and this is all about engagement. And I'm not a big fan of the language of public-private partnerships actually because partnerships can imply very formal contractual arrangements, and I think so much of understanding and bringing out the best of business and the best of government working together with civil society is about just engaging, not necessarily a very formal... So I'm talking about the kinds of things Jane was talking about, the sort of system-level coalitions, alliances, dialogs, the kinds of things David is pioneering. And I often say to all my GAIN colleagues – We are not champions of business. We are champions of engaging with business. And that is a very important distinction. And there's this African saying. Some of you have heard me say it before, and I like repeating it because it really resonates with me. *You can't change somebody's head unless they're in the room.* So we have to talk, even with the people we disagree with,

in fact most importantly with the people we disagree with, if we're going to advance nutrition. Thanks. Thanks for that.

Peter Thank you so much, Lawrence, and from our perspective at USCIB Foundation we're looking forward to continuing engagement with you. And just regarding our next opportunity for engagement, and I mentioned before in Rome in a few weeks we are going to want to explore some practical, tangible ways to implement and scale coordinated initiatives to put the draft principles into practice. And the program is going to focus on undernutrition and the rise of overweight and obesity, as well as the associated diet-related non-communicable diseases. And we're inviting to contribute to the discussion leaders of government, development agencies, and the private sector from a wide range of countries but with a particular focus on developing countries with the high burdens of malnutrition. We're also going to meet, as I mentioned with the U.N. food and agriculture agencies to see if they're interested in helping us to promote and spread the principles globally.

Q&A

So there we are. Time flies by when you're having fun, and I see the clock says 5 minutes and 24 seconds and counting. And I had hoped to have a little bit of time for some questions and answers before our panelists give you a farewell thought. Can we have one or two rapid-fire questions to one, your pick of our panelists? Any, any questions or comments? I can't really see. Over there.

Q Hello. I'm Lisa Amash from France. I'm so happy to actually see that there are companies such as PepsiCo involved in nutrition and food and then understand how complex talking about food is, how complex it is to talk about food and nutrition. But now I wonder how complex it is to actually reduce the amount of sugar in our drinks and our food today. And we all know that sugar is the cause of degeneration of our cells, etc., so just thank you.

Ellen Thanks for this question and remark. And absolutely it is very true, but you may be aware that as PepsiCo we have set very clear and ambitious objectives as part of our performance with purpose commitments. On the website we audited every... , the progress is being audited every year. We try to be as transparent as possible. I can tell you as vision R&D probably 80% of everyone involved coming up with innovations, it's all directed towards innovations that meet our internal nutritional guardrails and guidelines we have set for the amount of protein, whole grains but especially sugar levels. And we are now at a phase that no new innovations will be approved that will not meet our guardrails unless they get a very high, an exception, approval at the very highest level. Because there are always reasons they say well in this case I want an exception. So that is actually what we are doing, so a lot of effort and time to really achieve our ambitions to reduce the sugar but especially also to add more positive nutrition to our products.

Lawrence Ellen, will you... Sorry to jump you in this – Will you be publishing those commitments, and will you be publishing the audits so we can see what your commitments are and whether you've met them?

Ellen Absolutely. We have done it and they are very clearly laid out, not in a two-page document but very, very well laid out and even our nutritional guardrails and everything. Because to be fair, we struggled ourselves and we say – What do we call nutrition? Where is this ratio – how much sugar is still acceptable, how much salt is still acceptable? And we have based our guardrails really on external bodies like WHO and whatever; those criteria we have used to basically set our internal guardrails for our product development teams.

Peter Do we have a question over here?

Q Thank you very much indeed, and my name is David Nabarro, and I've been working on these issues. This is a really important panel. I was so impressed when the Governor said that *You collaborate at the speed of trust*. And I think I would like to encourage all concerned to stretch further than seems possible when it comes to finding ways to build trust. And that means, although I don't think rigid partnerships are the way to go, partnering as a way of behaving – it's really Lawrence's last point – is the key. And in my own experience working closely with members of the World Business Council on Sustainable Development, the big stretch is still to come. And it is commitments that are so public, so clear on every single packaging that companies produce to which there is a total, total will to be accountable. And in reaching those commitments, I would like to encourage the absolute overarching principle of *no harm to people or planet*. And I think it's possible, may take a year or two, but if we can get towards that kind of moon shot like we heard this morning from the Under Secretary for Agriculture, a moon shot on where we're trying to get to, I think it could make a big difference. It's not a question. It's just really encouragement to everybody concerned to just keep that level of ambition high, because with that degree of total commitment, accountable commitment, the trust might come. Thank you.

Peter Thank you, David, for your inspiring challenge.

Ellen David, there's a point that I'm... Yeah, there's a level of ambition high and the level of mutual accountability high, and if we keep both, they're different sides of the same coin. And I think that's where the real opportunity lies in this area of coalitions.

Peter Governor, any message to leave the audience with?

John I will just say in terms of those two goals, a block chain was mentioned, but one of the things block chain does is provide you a way of having total transparency and total accountability. Ninety-nine percent of the people in the United States or in the world aren't concerned with winning these battles, but they still want to have trust, and trust needs transparency, and block chain is one of the things that we'll be able to track every tomato from stem to table, every pork shoulder – you name it. We'll be able to track it all over the world, and people will be able to go back and hold each other accountable.

Question How long will it take?

John Two years, four years?

Question Yeah, I think three.

John He said three years, so I just want to be validated, because that rarely happens.

Peter Ellen, last thought?

Ellen Well, maybe one thought in terms of especially labeling of the products. We absolutely couldn't agree more. The main issue that we see is the proliferation, the fragmentation of labeling on the products across the markets. It's not adding any value. It's very confusing for the consumers. It is taking a lot of time and resources that we all would like to spend in a different way. So if somebody could step up and align and say – this is how we label, how we do the nutrition labeling on products across markets, that will be an absolute mega step.

Peter Well, that's the last word. We're out of time. I'm going to give you a last word anyway. So we've had a great panel. I thank all of you. We've talked a lot about catalyzing partnerships that can have a transformative impact on nutrition outcomes, talked about leveraging innovation and entrepreneurship, technology deployment, and in the case of business walking the talk and demonstrating the fruits of our engagement.

So I want to thank the audience for being here today. Sorry we couldn't take more questions. I want to thank the World Food Prize and all of its supporters and want to have us all give our panel a big round of applause. Thank you.

Ambassador Quinn

So, Peter, that was terrific. Thank you so very much, everyone. Ellen, I want to say next year will be the 10th anniversary of Indra Nooyi coming here to the World Food Prize and saying we need a revolution in nutrition to match the Green Revolution. So we're going to have something next year, and we'll have you back or have another session like this next year, continue that emphasis.

And, Governor, you were a Brewer, I think, as well, so five years ago in honor of the Borlaug Centennial of his birth, we brewed a beer called Borlauger. So your being here has inspired me. We're going to have Borlauger at the 2019 World Food Prize Symposium, so more incentive to come back. And it's highly nutritious, I assure you. Thank you all very much.