EE24 Survey 3 Results

Participants were given lists of system-wide interventions that came out strongly from Workshop 2 and asked ``Please indicate your level of agreement with the effectiveness of the following interventions in reducing the likelihood of a food system crisis:'' and presented with a slider to score between 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The ranked results are presented in the tables in this Appendix, along with the weighted averages and numbers of responses per score. Interventions that did not make the top 20 interventions are shaded grey.

Participants were asked ``Please provide any (optional) comments on system-wide interventions e.g. caveats, better wordings or interventions that are higher priority?''. The answers were ordered and grouped manually into sections when analysing the Survey 3 results, and are included below as bullet points.

1. System-wide interventions

System-wide / in all boxes:	Weighted average	1	2	3	4	5
B. Longer-termism in policy planning	4.71	0	0	1	3	13
G. Food system thinking in governments and industries	4.35	0	2	0	5	10
C. Stronger international collaboration	4.29	0	0	2	8	7
E. Forum for diverse voices to contribute to preparedness and planning	4.29	0	1	1	7	8
F. Introduce a National Food Strategy, Land Use Strategy, Horticulture Strategy	3.88	1	2	2	5	7
D. Wargaming to improve decision-making	3.76	0	3	3	6	5
A. Increased food system monitoring	3.71	0	2	6	4	5

General

- The different interventions partly depend on each other for their success and will have to be used together.
- I believe that A is important initially and ongoing to track progress but initially it is also important to undertake E, G and F in the short-term which feed into B. C & D are provide macro context.
- More thinking on the national security elements of food security and the relative role of govt vs industry in a volatile world

B. Longer-termism in policy planning

- Would all be useful. Having longer-termism, incl long-term strategies, is critical, to make sure we have the right goals for our food system, including on resilience, and that we have useful measures

- insuring a cross-scale and long(er) term thinking recognizing that everyone in the space works to different time scales for disaster planning.

G. Food system thinking in governments and industries

- There also needs to be a question on need for cross-government leadership on food. Some risks are owned by other Departments not just Defra.
- food system thinking is difficult to justify for many actors as they don't have remit to consider the wider system - so need to consider levers/incentives to take a broader approach

C. Stronger international collaboration

- stronger international collaboration is good but when push comes to shove does collaboration hold? Every country was for themselves when accessing covid vaccines

E. Forum for diverse voices to contribute to preparedness and planning

- E. Forum for diverse voices and informed by those in poverty
- Diversity across the whole value chain is key, each step
- I think that the forum for diverse voices is the MOST important aspect on this list, and if it were incorporated into all of the other interventions, then it would markedly improve their quality
- A group of businesses with gov talking about real on the ground issues as they arise; drive collaborative and system problem solving in the moment. Nothing like experiencing something to understand it

F. Introduce a National Food Strategy, Land Use Strategy, Horticulture Strategy

- (f) govt strategies, like this, historically, have only marginal impact
- Strategies don't have any teeth, so for them to be effective there would have to be strong buy-in and willingness across the food system to follow the strategies voluntarily.
- The national strategies need to be more than just strategies-- they need some teeth in them to translate into action, rather than just sitting on a shelf or getting de-prioritised.
- F. Introduce National Strategies: this kind of planning with future climate is essential.

D. Wargaming to improve decision-making

- All of these interventions help, war gaming would be good as I think fast reactions will be critical to manage events, then long terms plans to prevent events happening!
- Wargaming appears to get stakeholder buy-in but the scenario needs to be well considered and the 'gaming' well executed
- (d) sustained wargaming
- D. Wargaming: I guess you are meaning scenario planning here, which I think is a better name.
- I did not understand wargaming question.
- D &E: wargaming with diverse stakeholders is essential. If we don't play these scenarios out across multiple stakeholders we're not going to surface the actions that need taking.

A. Increased food system monitoring

- (a) monitoring scored lower as it doesn't account for decision making (i.e., action) shortfalls
- Monitoring only works if it is provides the data to enable action; monitoring alone doesn't do anything (but you can't take action on what you dont see/understand)
- Alignment of policy, standards and metrics between food procurement through supply chain standards to the outcomes that can be delivered by agroecological farming, with space through land use frmk.

- A and G are linked. In practice many key metrics are monitored, but signals are often unclear/ contested, information/ insights are not shared and ability to take coordinated action is limited.
- Food co's know what monitors are effective - the CCP's exist - they should be brought together voluntarily before while policy is agreed
- A key issue in a) is data availability across the food chain.
- The increased food system monitoring could be useful, depending on what is being monitored and what levers are in place to act if the monitoring system identifies potential increasing threat.

Other issues

- Collaboration at a pre-competitive level but designed to face into how to positively work together instead of shying away from possible CMA issues. Co's should push boundaries to work together
- I just do not agree the highest likelihood that a food crisis will be set off by fear of unsafe food..personally think it will be lack of availability of food...especially if cyber is the route issue
- Learning from other countries is vital - gov needs to be open to that, not closed. We do not have a monopoly on good practise!
- I think that an effective food enforcement/ surveillance regime should also be factored in
- And policies are not the be all and end all...

2. Cyber-attack interventions

Interventions primarily addressing cyber-attack	Weighted average	1	2	3	4	5
H. Securing UK infrastructure (physical and digital)	4.47	0	0	3	3	11
I. Decentralisation of food distribution	3.35	0	4	5	6	2

General

- Potential for cyber attack to have most impact when the system is stressed by other issues (trade disruptions etc)
- Importance of joined up government policy (eg energy/ food/ digitalisation)
- In reality when it breaks down there is a rush to secure lorries and drivers and prices rush up. Something to better manage and prioritise nationally would be helpful

New: Diversifying food distribution

- Rather than decentralising food distribution, I think we need a diversity of means for distributing food. There are efficiencies and positive elements of a centralised food distribution, but we also
- need to support other routes to distribute food, as this would likely also meet other objectives in the food system.

- These two solutions will work best concurrently. Secure infrastructure is an immediate concern but diversifying the food system is equally important but will take longer and will require investment.

H. Securing UK infrastructure (physical and digital)

- H. Securing UK infrastructure (physical and digital): essential but there's also a range of resources orgs have to deploy - not everyone will be able, and actors are motivated
- It depends on what is meant by 'securing UK infrastructure'. There are lots of benefits from supporting localised food systems, in the UK and abroad, incl avoiding 'all our eggs in one basket'
- Not just an energy story, but also data, general security, and 'slow down' attacks

I. Decentralisation of food distribution

- I. Decentralisation of food distribution: with more distribution we have greater resilience if individual sites are impacted. However, what systems are they all running on? Is there a shared vulnerable
- Ukraine has demonstrated the effectiveness of decentralised responses to intense cyber attack on civic infrastructure.
- In the final report/recommendation the term decentralisation would need to be defined as I think its efficacy as an intervention would depend on what exactly it entailed
- Consumers may also not be able to pay for food if you have cyber attack. I did not understand decentralisation question? The food system is centralised i.e. only 4-5 major supermarkets in UK.
- There are lots of benefits from supporting localised food systems, in the UK and abroad, incl avoiding 'all our eggs in one basket'
- Decentralisation may not lead to better preparedness if local level assets/systems are not well protected from cyber threats, or vary significantly in levels of protection
- Sudden decentralisation of a centralised system is chaotic. This should be looked into and planned for if indeed it would be helpful. A backup manual system would be useful if hard work
- Decentralism will have massive cost..which will be borne by consumers and unlikely adopted by private sector....

3. Extreme weather interventions

Interventions primarily addressing extreme weather.	Weighted average	1	2	3	4	5
N. More agroecology / regenerative agriculture	4.00	0	1	5	4	7
P. Increased farmer support	3.94	0	2	3	6	6
M. Diversifying UK food production	3.88	0	1	4	8	4
K. Improve infrastructure e.g. drainage / flood	3.82	0	2	3	8	4
L. Crop viability review	3.69	0	2	5	5	4
J. Investment in early warning systems	3.50	0	4	4	4	4

O. Investment in controlled environment agriculture	3.29	0	4	7	3	3

General

- Farmers need to be paid to shift to the right crops and farming techniques or they simply won't do it. A national transition strategy should be drawn up and subsidies controlled to deliver the shift
- Options L, M and N work together with options J & K coming after the viability review/modelling of likely climatic scenarios. P & O are important but must be informed by the earlier options.
- J-P depend a lot on an overall strategic approach and what that means. In one extreme, fiddling with UK agriculture may have marginal impact if importing remains a good option (or vice versa)
- "These two together - the review is needed, and support is needed to transition/action. L. Crop viability review; P. Increased farmer support: without this nothing will happen"

New: trade

- I think it is also important to link this to trade policy and how we are ensuring resilience
- Account for extreme weather impacts internationally and not just on impact on food production.

Additional

- Roads/rails/storage facilities are all underinvested for normal conditions and under extreme conditions they fail fast
- What also about better rainwater collection for drought events?

N. More agroecology / regenerative agriculture

- Regen will only work if it's affordable. Wildfarmed etc is unrealistically priced currently to ever reach scale.
- I think the most important thing on this list is more agroecology, to build up resilience to extreme events, including improving farms'/farmers' ability to recover from extreme events.
- The most important intervention is to rapidly decarbonise and to switch to agroecological/ regenerative systems as soon as possible
- agroecology/regen ag would help to improve the health and structure of the soil which should help buffer it from a variety of extreme weather events (drought, heavy rainfall, potentially higher temp)

P. Increased farmer support

- may want to specify a little on the farmer support, e.g. which type of farmers, what kind of support (advocacy, investment)
- P. Farmer support - perhaps assumes financial, but the more effective intervention would be intensive joint planning at all levels (e.g., wargaming) to set everyone's expectations

M. Diversifying UK food production

- Diversification only works if there's a market - develop the demand ahead of harvest
- Intersecting across crop viability review and diversifying UK food production is looking to the genetic diversity of the crops we grow to integrate crops and varieties of crops that are more resilient
- Diversification of uk food production is a good strategy but unclear how it helps with extreme weather. If a field is flooded it will affect production regardless of crop

- Profitable farmers will be the most resilient ones. I would support diversification as it increases resilience

K. Improve infrastructure e.g. drainage / flood

- Unclear what improvements to infrastructure would help with extreme weather event - are you thinking air conditioning for factories so they can operate in heat waves, or improved refrigeration units?

L. Crop viability review

- Crop viability for extreme weather must be incentivised to grow more climate friendly crops - but consumer/retailer demand must also be there so join it up. NPD for climate resilient ingredients
- L. the review itself wouldn't constitute an intervention but the principle of assessing and then transitioning to more viable 'resilience food' crops is solid doi 10.1007/s13280-022-01715-1
- I don't think a crop viability review will do much for extreme weather. It was do for chronic cc impacts such as increased temperatures or reduced rainfall but won't help with extreme events

J. Investment in early warning systems

- Our current meteorological systems are pretty good already, I'm not sure what benefit additional investment would bring
- Investment in early warning systems is only an effective intervention if it allows the relevant people/organisations to take action to reduce risk

O. Investment in controlled environment agriculture

- Controlled env is expensive. Incentivise and make it easy to do e.g. planning, logistics, energy costs subsidies for hydro/aeroponics
- Early warning system investment needs to be coupled with people side support - motivation, skills, translation and understanding to turn it into action.
- controlled environment agriculture does seem to reduce the risk from extreme weather (provided the electricity stays on).

4. International Conflict Interventions

Interventions primarily addressing international conflict	Weighted average	1	2	3	4	5
U. Diversify supply chains	3.94	2	0	2	6	7
Q. Increase UK energy security (e.g. renewables)	3.82	1	2	3	4	7
T. Increase diversity of UK diets	3.82	1	1	4	5	6
S. Increase UK self-sufficiency in food	3.41	1	0	10	3	3
R. Load shedding (industry and government working together)	3.18	1	4	4	7	1

General

- I see all these options as important and working together to prepare for external conflicts - and some of the other scenarios.
- No 'confused' international strategies - some collaboration, other not, and conflicting values in action and demonstration.
- Again, some of the efficacy of these interventions depends on what we're building resilience too. Energy security in general is a good thing, but agric needs fertiliser (currently largely imported)..
- The key thing for me is encouraging cooperation and mutual trust between countries, promoting peace, and trying to avoid international conflict in the first place.
- Improved planning and protection for food infra' would be highly effective - e.g., missile defence system protecting grain facilitates, armed guarding etc.

U. Diversify supply chains

- Ensure a better mapping/ understanding of supply chain resilience/ reliance of particular parts of the world, including for inputs, to enable mitigation
- Increasing diversity is a really important aspect of improving resilience-- so increased diversity of crops, diets, supply chain routes-- all of these build resilience because it increases our ability to move between crops/foods/routes if disaster strikes any one of them. Basic premise of spreading your eggs across many baskets!
- when considering supply chains it is important to consider the entire supply chain just not the country of production.
- Points T and U could be refined to focus on the types of diversity that could strengthen resilience of food supply in the context of international conflict (e.g. local, low input).
- More diversified supply chains creates less opportunity to support the system quickly and effectively without huge cost and inefficiency.
- Beyond that, having more diversity in our fields, our supply chains and our diets will be helpful for greater overall resilience.
- Sourcing from different countries is not an effective mitigation strategy as different supply chains tend to rely on the same infrastructure/regions - the Netherlands, Suez canal etc

Q. Increase UK energy security (e.g. renewables)

- Q. Increase UK energy security (e.g. renewables): not just energy - what are the key items e.g. CO2 for food packaging that wasn't known pre-covid
- More support for driving on-shore wind and biomass will unlock many farmers who have the land/capacity/raw materials already available
- Perhaps need for more cold-storage facilities, not just energy supply....
- I don't see how increasing uk energy security helps to prevent a food crises during international conflict when we source so much of our food from abroad

T. Increase diversity of UK diets

- even with an increase in diversity of uk diets, consumers would still want foods that can't be grown here
- Diet diversity will help but will take a long time to scale. If taste/cost/convenience is not there it will not succeed at consumer level

S. Increase UK self-sufficiency in food

- I don’t think we can only increase UK self sufficiency, it needs to link in with the earlier question around building resilience in international supply chains too;

- Increasing the self sufficiency of UK food supply may not reduce the risk of supply shocks in the event of international conflict if domestic supply still relies on imported inputs.
- Focus should also be on seasonal UK produce and also preserving.
- self sufficiency for food isn't a viable option - the UK is extremely small in a geographical sense with a single drought event able to wipe out an entire crop. It would be a high risk strategy
- self sufficiency isn't possible based on consumer preferences - we can't grow what people want to eat
- We are 60% self-sufficient and it is cost and lack of infrastructure/product availability which calls for imports, these would need to be addressed systemically.

R. Load shedding (industry and government working together)

- Load shedding as a last resort as it has major cost consequences plus animal/human welfare and crop spoilage fallout. If it has to be used it has to be coordinated and prioritised to preserve supply
- I'm less convinced about load shedding ...Ronald Reagan quote, worst words in English "I am from the government and here to help"!
- Not familiar with "load shedding" as a term, but i assume it relates to sharing risk and benefits of transition
- I don't understand load shedding again from an international conflict perspective when we source so much food from abroad
- R. This will happen to a degree, but the effectiveness would be increased through joint planning and exercising, plus maybe legislation

5. Price / Availability Interventions

Interventions primarily addressing food price or availability shock	Weighted average	1	2	3	4	5
W. Good social security	4.53	0	0	2	4	11
V. Civil / community resilience plans	4.35	0	1	2	4	10
X. Cash transfers to poorest people in emergency	4.06	0	0	6	4	7
AB. Government media and comms strategy prepared for emergency	4.06	0	0	5	6	6
Y. Rationing by government / retailers in emergency	3.47	0	1	9	5	2
AA. Review over-regulation / increase agility of food system	3.35	1	1	8	5	2
Z. Blockchain to increase traceability	2.71	2	4	8	3	0

General

- if the complete system is more resilient and reoriented to improved outcomes, it has a higher chance of responding better to shocks without freezing out vulnerable communities.
- Retailers should also be able to share data like we did in pandemic
- It would be helpful to include the important role the food industry, especially retailers, can play in ensuring food reaches people and that they support those most in need

W. Good social security

- The more we can do to close the gap between the wealthy and poorest in our country, the farther we go to supporting all households in case of a price/availability crisis.
- Having a properly functioning social security system is critical. Other interventions important too, but having a good safety net is vital. More broadly, UBI or similar would bring longer-term benefit
- Social security must support people who cannot support themselves in an availability shock to ensure safe, secure and fair distribution of food
- Unclear what 'good social security' means - could be clarified/ made more precise.
- W helps to establish a less unequal society before a crisis/polycrisis which is important because it put less pressure on crisis strategies. V & X are important for the poorest in society in crisis.
- Good social safety net/equal society is the best buffer against food shocks
- Families on social security are disproportionately experiencing food insecurity, currently. A review and uplift needs to be a priority.

V. Civil / community resilience plans

- Community plans would have to be drawn up with local retailers at the centre, there is noone in local gov. with the knowledge or capability
- Community based actions are key (i.e. the community resilience plan) because communities know best their own challenges and what resources they have to support those specific challenges.
- This seems like the most traceable with intervention all scoring well [in Workshop 3]. Broadly this is about intimate community planning, empowerment, decentralisation and transparency
- Community resilience plans are a good back-up for an extreme event
- V. - some poor communities do not have the tools to put in place resilience plans. This would need to be initiated through co-design.

X. Cash transfers to poorest people in emergency

- Cash is king in a crisis but also help people get access to actual food too
- Cash transfers to poorest people was not very clear. It would be helpful to have an option around improving/ expanding support to those most in need which is not necessarily through cash transfers
- X. Cash transfers to poorest people: if costs are so high money might not be enough, may need to be resource allocation

AB. Government media and comms strategy prepared for emergency

- Comms is probably the most critical piece of the puzzle. Pragmatic/clear/compassionate & open. Worth getting this in place during the war gaming phase so the comms team are in the room, test the msg

- Having a comms strategy and guidelines/policy for when rationing is implemented - even in commercial settings - would good. Block chain and over regulation are less important and bring other risks.
- AB. This must include 'pre-dunking' / other counter disinformation methods. And to increase effectiveness, it should include tested emergency comms channels and platforms
- AB. - consideration given to those without home internet access.

Y. Rationing by government / retailers in emergency

- Necessary rationing needs to be very carefully coordinated so as not to produce panic
- Rationing could help, but could also amplify the shock and trigger anger/riots
- Y. Rationing by government / retailers: if this had been implemented in early covid we could have reduced impacts, costs spiralling, etc. More planning needed.

AA. Review over-regulation / increase agility of food system

- "review over-regulation" is a leading statement - prefer to say review the integration, effectiveness and enforcement of regulation
- Derogations are common in emergencies - it would be helpful to have a sliding scale of which regs would be removed/paused in a crisis so the whole supply chain can move at once. A HACCP style analysis
- AA combines two different things - over-regulation and increased agility. Increased agility is very important, but lack of agility is not necessarily down to over-regulation. They should be separated.
- AA seems a bit of a red-herring. Need to do more to increase agility and emergency local food networks. They are not typically held back by "red tape"
- Food hoarding is likely to an issue here, so for AA. (and to protect X.) some legislation banning hoarding would support effectiveness.
- Really don't think over-regulation is the intervention (but maybe I'm not aware of a barrier)

Z. Blockchain to increase traceability

- Z. Blockchain: systems are nowhere near ready for this
- Blockchain could provide high visibility and control but would require contracting to allow access by central/local gov. Could be hard to implement due to commercial practise and legal implications
- Unclear (to me) what the role of blockchain technology might be.
- All constructive, but I cant see how blockchain would help at all, it is just a traceability system...does not help with the price issues

6. Successful Interventions we can Learn From

Participants were asked ``What successful interventions can we learn lessons from? (Could be food-related, or non-food relating to crisis avoidance etc.) Consider different levels of government (local, devolved, international) as well as policy and other interventions across other sectors (industry, charities, non-profit etc). Any links to websites, documents that would help us track it down would be great, or email us a document separately. What can we learn from this intervention to help reduce the chance of a food system crisis?".

We have grouped and categorised the responses in the below list.

UK shocks

- Lots of good stuff from COVID re local household resilience and local food networks
- Response of food system to Covid...simply amazing and largely private sector led with constructive help from government.
- I guess the pandemic was a food system shock.
- DEFRA convened the food industry well during Covid. David Kennedy is worth interviewing as he co-ordinated it.
- I think a lot can be learned from the Covid response, good and bad - in terms of how how the UK and devolved governments worked with retailers/ food industry and local authorities to provide food
- CO2 shortages lessons https://www.fdf.org.uk/fdf/resources/publications/reports/falling-flat-lessons-from-the-2018-uk-co2-shortage/

UK initiatives

- The bringing together of experts and experts-by-experience can help to form a more rounded response through the inclusion of voices of those in food insecurity. This may be of value - https://theippo.co.uk/food-poverty-policy-free-school-meal-provision/
- Good Food Nation Act (Scotland) - framework act that brings together issues 'in the round'
- Wellbeing of Future Generations Act (Wales) - ensures decisions are made with future generations in mind

International shocks

- Irish dairy sector after 2008 crisis
- Jordan and refugees: https://www.e-ir.info/2023/05/04/the-jordanian-response-to-the-syrian-refugee-crisis-from-a-resilience-perspective/
- https://www.pc.gov.pk/uploads/newsletter/Updated_12_Pages-Pakistan%20Floods%202022.pdf (Pakistan and floods post 2022)
- https://www.brookings.edu/articles/cape-town-lessons-from-managing-water-scarcity/
- recent lessons from guinea https://www.imf.org/en/News/Articles/2024/06/20/cf-easing-guineas-food-insecurity-the-imfs-food-shock-window

International initiatives

- general (not shock related, but good lessons): North Karelia project: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7444010/
- Some lessons may be available from Denmark and Finland where coalitions of farmers, policy makers, NGOs and others are debating seriously the future of land use and food to drive a plant-forward futur (from previous answer - https://klimaraadet.dk/da/analyse/danmarks-fremtidige-arealanvendelse (needs translating) is a summary of Danish situation and https://www.foodnavigator.com/Article/2023/12/14/
- Esquela de Gigantes, La Paz, Bolivia
- H.O.P.E., Surakarta, Indonesia

- https://www.worldbank.org/en/news/feature/2020/11/17/the-adaptation-principles-6-ways-to-build-resilience-to-climate-change
- https://www.prb.org/articles/five-actions-to-help-build-equitable-climate-resilience/
  https://unfccc.int/topics/adaptation-and-resilience/the-big-picture/introduction#adaptation

Other

- As the situation goes on, central government response effectiveness will decline (before improving to pre-crisis levels in the future) so decentralised approaches that pre-empt this are best
- I am not aware of specific examples but suspect we can learn from overseas examples, and possibly in particular food crises in developing countries/famine even if context differs.
- I guess we need to get better at looking into how some of these risks combine and cascade through the system
- what about learning lessons from examples of perverse success?

7. Principles for Designing Interventions

Participants were asked:
``What principles should be considered when designing interventions?
E.g. based on your input at Workshop 2, to get the ball rolling how about:

`Interventions should
(i) address root causes of both chronic and acute risks as much as possible
(ii) consider how we can bring dignity, kindness and fairness into policymaking
(iii) involve people affected by the interventions
(iv) take into account power dynamics and diversity of different organisations (e.g. not just the big retailers) and
(v) take a food systems approach.'

Do you know of a relevant framework or set of principles that has been used before?

What do you think of the 5 proposed principles above? Do you know of a relevant framework or set of principles that has been used before?"

The answers have been grouped and categorised in the below list.

Improvements

- They are all very good. Add:
  (a) have a clear trajectory outlined and start transformational steps early
  (b) empower individuals and communities
  (c) push decisions to the lowest possible levels
  (d) train and rehearse
- I agree with (iv), but it sounds a bit vague. Maybe instead something like 'consider how this will address power imbalances in the sector'?

- "These are strong. I would amend (iii) to - co-design the interventions with those disproportionately affected"
- Like them - perhaps something specific on a just transition and building resilience also?
- I agree with these. Would add a joined up approach across government, long-term planning/ understanding of risks to enable contingency planning, transparency and sharing of data
- Equity should be the foundation for intervention design. Ensuring everyone will benefit with those most at risk accounted for through extra strategies and support.
- Avoiding conflicts of interest is also important. Ensuring that all voices and experiences are heard but having decisions being made without influential voices being at the table.
- Decision making should then be followed by further consultation and pre-implementation assessments with a lens of effectiveness and equity.

References

- I have developed a Food Insecurity Framework as part of a module I deliver. Together we could see how this would lend itself to the principles noted above.
- Principles are good other principles: https://justruraltransition.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/12/2023/04/JRT_Principles_Report_170423.pdf https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC9145425/ https://futureoffood.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/GA_PrinciplesDoc.pdf also BATWOVE tool for stresstesting interentions
- I think they are good and don't know of a framework from previous use but perhaps this can be combined with the 3Rs approach. I also tihnk the elements above need to be linked together/interact
- I like these - and some look similar to principles we co-designed https://www.foodethicscouncil.org/opinion/back-to-basics-five-principles-for-fair-policies/

Comments

- It is helpful to include the caveat 'as much as possible' in point (i). In some cases the root cause may be a structural issue beyond the scope of an individual intervention to address.
- Involve people at all levels and across the system. Must take account of power dynamics as this power can be used to help
- Interventions should address the root cause where possible. If this isn't possible then they should aim to create resilience within the most vulnerable groups
- They are fine, but a bit motherhood and apple pie, because each one costs and where will the money come from?
- I fully agree with the principle of 'taking a food systems approach', but it will be important to clarify what this means in practice.
- Take a generational approach for farmers or they will not shift. Their land is their 'birthright.'
- A shift in resulting diet from changes will still have to provide food people want or it will reverse"
- Creating policies that support equitable societies such as a restriction on the gap between the highest and lowest earner in an organisation/business is an important strategy for an equitable society.
- all important in this order V, III, IV, I, II

- I think the 5 principles are great! i and v are interrelated-- we need to take a systems approach in order to address root causes.
- ii and iii are also closely related-- we are likely to get more dignified, kind and fair outcomes if those with lived experience are embedded in the policy-making/ decision-making process.
- Also how they could combine! and create a contagion