

# 1 Developing policy to support sustainable diets in Aotearoa New Zealand with 2 contributors

3 Bruce Kidd<sup>1</sup>, Dr Hemi Enright<sup>2</sup>, Dr Christina McKerchar<sup>2</sup>, Dr Christine Cleghorn<sup>1</sup>

4 <sup>1</sup>*Department of Public Health, University of Otago, Wellington, 23A Mein Street, Newtown, Wellington 6021, New Zealand*

5 <sup>2</sup>*Department of Population Health, University of Otago, Christchurch, PO Box 4345, Christchurch 8140, New Zealand*

6 <sup>1</sup>*Corresponding author: Bruce Kidd, [brucekidd@proton.me](mailto:brucekidd@proton.me), Department of Public Health, University of Otago, Wellington,*  
7 *23A Mein Street, Newtown, Wellington 6021, New Zealand*

8

## 9 Abstract

10 Aotearoa New Zealand (Aotearoa NZ) is an example of a high-income country with high  
11 environmental impacts and health consequences associated with its food system. These impacts can  
12 be partially addressed by enabling dietary transitions to healthy and sustainable diets. The EAT-  
13 Lancet Commission proposed an internationally acceptable reference diet to promote planetary  
14 health. We aimed to work with contributors to develop policy actions to support New Zealanders to  
15 transition to healthy sustainable diets. These policies were further examined according to the World  
16 Cancer Research Fund, NOURISHING and High Level Panel of Experts (HLPE) on Food Security and  
17 Nutrition Food System frameworks. Semi-structured interviews (13) and focus groups (6) were  
18 conducted with contributors from government agencies, industry, academics, community and rural  
19 and urban tangata whenua communities. All interviews and focus groups were first transcribed using  
20 Otter.ai then reviewed by the research team. Thematic analysis was used to identify and summarise  
21 each policy. 111 policies were suggested across the NOURISHING framework policy domains: 11  
22 (10%) in behaviour change communication; 35 (32%) in the food environment; and 65 (59%)  
23 addressing the food system. Participants spoke of behaviour change communication policies of  
24 education, awareness campaigns, and workshops such as cooking classes. Food environment policies  
25 targeted supermarkets and food retail, local food environments, and government standards and  
26 regulations including food taxes and subsidies. Policies in the food system area looked at food waste,  
27 supporting local food production and government structures and support. Contributors identified  
28 policies that advocate and support planetary health.

## 29 Key policy insights

- 30  The majority of policies identified by contributors focused on food systems and specifically  
31 food production
- 32  Many contributors highlighted existing policies or initiatives already implemented locally and  
33 nationally but needed further support
- 34  There is limited research demonstrating the effectiveness of policies and initiatives  
35 addressing sustainable food systems in Aotearoa New Zealand
- 36  Funding, resources and research of existing local initiatives and policies supporting  
37 sustainable food systems in Aotearoa New Zealand and globally are urgently required

38

## 39 Keywords

40 Sustainable diets, Policy, Aotearoa New Zealand, Planetary health

41

## Introduction

42 Food systems impose significant health and environmental impacts globally, which can be addressed  
43 by enabling dietary transitions to healthy and sustainable diets.<sup>1-3</sup> Currently, food systems globally  
44 contribute to 34% of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from activities relating to agriculture and land  
45 use, storage, transport, packaging, processing, retail, and food consumption.<sup>4</sup> Other environmental  
46 impacts include the deterioration of water resources and loss of habitat and biodiversity. In  
47 Aotearoa NZ, agriculture accounted for 50% of gross GHG emissions in 2020, due to the prominent  
48 role of the agricultural industry in the Aotearoa NZ economy.<sup>5,6</sup>

49 The EAT-Lancet Commission<sup>2</sup> proposed an internationally acceptable reference diet or 'planetary  
50 diet' based on Rockström et al.'s<sup>10</sup> planetary boundaries to promote planetary health. Six of the nine  
51 boundaries (climate change, biodiversity loss, freshwater use, interference with the global nitrogen  
52 and phosphorus cycles, and land-system change) are greatly affected by food production. The  
53 planetary diet depicts a sustainable and healthy diet as high in unprocessed plant-based foods and  
54 low in animal-based foods, consistent with the international literature.<sup>11-13</sup> Much of this literature is  
55 on GHG emissions<sup>14-17</sup> with less attention given to the other planetary boundaries.<sup>18</sup> However,  
56 synergies between GHG emission impact of diets and impact on other planetary boundaries such as  
57 land use and water use are shown.<sup>18,19</sup>

58 The food system impacts the health of New Zealanders, with dietary risks and high body mass index  
59 accounting for the second and third highest contributors to health loss (DALYs) in 2017.<sup>7</sup>  
60 Additionally, diet-related health outcomes (such as obesity) are inequitably distributed.<sup>8</sup> These  
61 inequities represent a failure of policy and violate Te Tiriti o Waitangi (a treaty signed in 1840 by the  
62 Crown and tangata whenua) that includes the right to health equity.<sup>9</sup> Food systems are a key area to  
63 improve planetary health through reducing emissions and the consequences of climate change on  
64 resilience and food security.

65 A global perspective is taken by The Commission and does not provide specific policy actions for  
66 Aotearoa NZ to support their transition to a planetary diet. Utilising a food systems approach to  
67 policy development and implementation requires strong engagement with affected contributors and  
68 communities.<sup>20-22</sup> With high meat consumption and economic reliance on meat and dairy exports,  
69 Aotearoa NZ will face many challenges in achieving the necessary shifts to a planetary diet. There is a  
70 need to investigate what policies will be accepted by the Aotearoa NZ public with potential for  
71 implementation by policymakers. This includes cost-effectiveness and cultural acceptability.

72 Research indicates that strong engagement with contributors and policy-level support involving  
73 collaboration at different levels (such as national and local) are essential enablers for  
74 policymaking.<sup>21-23</sup> This research aims to address this research gap by conducting engagement with  
75 contributors to develop policy actions specific to Aotearoa NZ. Policies were matched to the World  
76 Cancer Research Fund NOURISHING and High Level Panel of Experts (HLPE) on Food Security and  
77 Nutrition Food System frameworks to better understand their focus. We aim to describe dietary  
78 policies identified during engagement with contributors to support New Zealanders to transition  
79 towards healthy sustainable diets.

80

## Methods

81

### Positionality

82 The primary aim of this research was to improve health outcomes for New Zealanders with a  
83 commitment to health equity and Te Tiriti o Waitangi, and a particular focus on Māori as tangata  
84 whenua (Indigenous peoples') of Aotearoa NZ. Bruce Kidd (he/him) and Cristina Cleghorn (she/her)  
85 are Pākehā (New Zealand European) who research food, health and sustainability and contribute to  
86 research that promotes planetary health and equity. Christina McKerchar (she/her) (Iwi affiliations  
87 are Ngāti Kahunguru, Ngāti Porou, Tūhoe) and Hemi Enright (he/him) (Iwi affiliations are Ngāpuhi,  
88 Ngāruahine, Ngāti Ruanui), are Māori health researchers in the kai (food) and food system space. We  
89 acknowledge that public health ethics of non-maleficence, social justice and an underlying  
90 philosophy of health equity guide our team.

91

### Engagement with contributors

92 Our research is part of the 'Sustainable New Zealand Kai' project funded by Healthier Lives He  
93 Oranga Hauora National Science Challenge (UOOX1902).<sup>24</sup> Engagement protocols were finalised with  
94 the project team and advisory group. We undertook engagement among government ministries,  
95 industry representatives, academics, urban and rural tangata whenua contributors, and a  
96 community group once these protocols were finalised.

97 Recruitment used publicly available information to invite industry representatives (without exclusion  
98 criteria) to attend a hui (meeting) with us. In tandem with this, the authors used snowballing to  
99 recruit other contributors for interviews and focus groups. We used a semi-structured approach to  
100 explore strategies to move towards healthy, sustainable food. For organisations where only one  
101 individual participated, we conducted contributor interviews using a semi-structured interview  
102 schedule, allowing the participant to contribute beyond the stated questions. Focus groups were run  
103 by Dr Cleghorn and Dr McKerchar. 57 participants took part in one of six focus groups (with an  
104 average of seven participants in each) and 13 participants were interviewed individually.

105 Focus groups followed a similar semi-structured approach used for the interviews. The stated  
106 questions included asking participants how government and ministries should support New  
107 Zealanders to eat healthy and sustainable foods, what policies/interventions could help New  
108 Zealanders eat a more healthy and sustainable diet, ideas on the implementation of their  
109 policies/interventions to ensure their effectiveness, and barriers to New Zealanders consuming  
110 healthy and sustainable food.

111 Focus groups and interviews were recorded with contributor consent and transcribed using the  
112 software "Otter.AI". Artificial Intelligence (AI) is increasingly used in public health research to  
113 streamline tasks and reduce human workload.<sup>25</sup> AI has predominantly been developed by non-Māori  
114 without consideration of our health context in Aotearoa, Kaupapa Māori ethics or Māori Data  
115 Sovereignty, which recognises that Māori data should be subject to Māori governance.<sup>26-28</sup> Otter.ai  
116 was a useful platform that allowed us to check transcripts and playback audio files while making  
117 amendments to the text. Since completing this research, the research team has reflected on the use  
118 of Otter.ai and decided to remove all audio files and transcriptions from the platform.

119 Notes on the specific policies were taken during interviews and cross-checked with transcriptions  
120 from recordings which were then used in thematic analysis. We used thematic analysis to identify  
121 the policies from the transcripts.<sup>28</sup> The policy name was used as the code. A longer description of  
122 each policy was provided and also reviewed for key themes. When a key theme emerged across  
123 more than one policy, the policies were grouped to discuss each theme. Policies and subsequent

124 themes were first analysed by BK and reviewed by CC and CM to confirm the final policy list and  
125 themes for the qualitative discussion.

126 Inclusion criteria for a policy during the extraction phase included if: the policy was from the  
127 participants' thinking and was mentioned without a prompt from the interviewer or focus group  
128 facilitator; and/or when elaborating on a prompt from the interviewer or focus group facilitator, the  
129 participant demonstrated original thinking on the policy, e.g., providing more detail or being more  
130 specific. Policies were excluded if mentioned by a participant who then provided no further details  
131 or discussion after a prompt from the interviewer or facilitator.

132 Policy extraction involved noting the key information relating to the policy and further quotes from  
133 participants to provide contextual information. This included information on the policy's scope (e.g.,  
134 what population it should apply to), implementation (e.g., the resources required) or any other  
135 related information. Implementation and other related information such as barriers were discussed  
136 in more detail during subsequent interviews and focus groups with contributors.

137 We analysed each policy to find its matched policy domain and associated policy area (See Table 1)  
138 in the NOURISHING framework.<sup>29</sup> If matched with the food system policy domain in the original  
139 NOURISHING framework (Harness food supply chain and actions across sectors to ensure coherence  
140 with health) they were subsequently matched to policy areas in the HLPE framework.<sup>30</sup> Once  
141 matched, the individual policies were reviewed to identify similar policies that could be grouped to  
142 develop a final 'unique' list of policies. See a summary of the policy extraction process in Figure 1.

143 *Figure 1: Overview of policy extraction process*

144 The NOURISHING framework promotes healthy diets by allowing policymakers to develop suitable  
145 policy responses across the three domains. Each domain is supported by evidence demonstrating  
146 their influence on what and how populations eat.<sup>29</sup> We used the NOURISHING framework as it  
147 provides a comprehensive framework detailing the different policy domains for public health  
148 nutrition.<sup>29</sup> The HLPE Food System Framework supplemented NOURISHING to expand the food  
149 system policy domain, as including a strong food systems focus was important for the objectives and  
150 outcomes of this project (Table 1). The NOURISHING framework was developed by the World Cancer  
151 Research Fund (WCRF) International to provide a comprehensive policy package with key domains of  
152 action and policy areas.<sup>29</sup> Microsoft Excel and Word were used to compile information on all policies  
153 and group them. When presenting quotes relating to policies' discussed by participants, punctuation  
154 was revised and text that is not required was omitted with a '[...]'. A final list of policies was created  
155 using the NOURISHING and HLPE Food System Frameworks.

156

157 *Table 1: Integrating NOURISHING and HLPE Food System Frameworks*

158

## Results

159 From the interviews and focus groups, 204 policies were identified including duplicate and similar  
160 policies. Of these 204 policies, 35 (17%) were categorised into **behaviour change communication**, 70  
161 (34%) into **food environment**, and 99 (49%) into **food system** policy domains (**Table 5**).

162 Policies were then reviewed to group together these duplicates to create a list of 111 unique  
163 policies. For the complete list of unique policies and number of mentions by contributors, see **Table**  
164 **2** in the appendix. The 111 unique policies were categorized into the following policy domains: 11  
165 (10%) in **behaviour change communication**, 35 (32%) in the **food environment**, and 65 (59%)  
166 addressed the **food system** (Figure 2). Policies and their supporting quotes are summarised below  
167 according to the NOURISHING framework (Figure 3).

168 *Figure 2: Unique policies by NOURISHING and HLPE Food System Frameworks*

169 *Figure 3: Overview of policies suggested by contributors*

170

### Food environment

171 The 35 unique **food environment** policies were identified across a range of settings, including  
172 supermarkets and food retail, farming and local food environments, food industry regulations, and  
173 government standards and regulations. Policies addressing supermarkets included advertising limits  
174 on promoting unhealthy food, shelf placements interventions, promoting recipes, low-cost ‘food  
175 bags’, and local food. Contributors discussed a need to diversify products sold by supermarkets to  
176 focus on health and the environment. Spaces in supermarkets were suggested to be re-organised to  
177 provide an improved experience for families when shopping, one suggestion was supermarket  
178 playgrounds for children.

179

180 Another person, similarly identified that there was *“a missed opportunity in supermarkets. I think*  
181 *they can play a really critical role in influencing households and families in terms of what they*  
182 *purchase but how they purchase it and how they use it”*.

183

184 Other participants spoke of supermarkets' overwhelming influence as a food environment and their  
185 dominance as a barrier to a localised, community-orientated food system. One participant said,

186 *“How much profit can supermarkets be allowed to make on certain items? That's where I*  
187 *see it. Because I know how much profit they're making. You know, like about delivering the kai to the*  
188 *people. It's not about a conglomerate called Foodstuffs, making as much money as possible”*

189

190 Contributors highlighted local food environments, such as farming and gardens in different settings,  
191 including schools and local communities with healthy food and drink policies, and government  
192 standards in eating and activity guidelines. Food industry regulation was discussed, citing advertising  
193 limits, food labelling, reformulation, increasing food access, and reducing food deserts. Government  
194 standards were discussed, such as incorporating sustainability into guidelines, taxes on unhealthy  
195 foods, subsidies on healthy foods, and wealth taxes for wealth redistribution. Participants also spoke  
196 of increasing incomes through increasing wages, benefits, and introducing a living wage and  
197 universal basic income. A participant spoke of increasing wages to make healthy and sustainable  
198 food more accessible, *“[...] income is one of the main determinants of how people eat, how much*

199 *healthy food they can afford, and we have a housing crisis. [...] So I think if you're thinking about*  
200 *barriers to sustainable food, the cost of living crisis is probably quite important..."*

### 201 **Food system**

202 The 65 unique policies within the **food system** policy domain first focused on food waste including  
203 providing more composting sites for the opportunity to compost food waste, and waste  
204 minimisation policies to remove excess materials that cannot be composted. Supporting sustainable  
205 and healthy farming practices and local food production, regulating inputs (such as fertilisers), and  
206 facilitating land use change were discussed. A participant explained the need for buy-in from farmers  
207 themselves, *"Because the agricultural sector groups have a vested interest in their producers being*  
208 *recognized for being [...] better than average. However, you define what that average is. So the idea*  
209 *of differentiating between produce from different farms [...] is [...] a good one"*

210

211 For local food production supporting community gardens through establishing a community garden  
212 network with food hubs and growing food indoors and outdoors, enabling rural communities to  
213 barter food, access wild food sources, support local milk production and home kill, and rewarding  
214 farmers for sustainable practices were raised. The necessary infrastructure for local food production  
215 was also discussed such as implementing a nationwide permaculture policy to encourage local food  
216 production. Land use change was raised in terms of diversifying the crops grown by farmers,  
217 engaging with farmers and providing incentives.

218

219 One participant discussed shifting funds from importing and exporting food, *"you could go about it*  
220 *by saying [...] like, we're not going to be exporting as much and we're not going to be able to import*  
221 *as much. And [...] look at all these markets that are available to us [...], you might have to sink some*  
222 *money into an indoor facility to make your citrus"*

223

224 Other system level policies raised by contributors included creating a new ministry department  
225 dedicated to food (e.g. a Ministry of Food) and reviewing legislation such as pesticides and  
226 herbicides laws. Participants spoke of the siloed and disconnected nature of how the government  
227 manages food which results in inefficiencies, *"[...] food as a concept sits over about 25 different*  
228 *government agencies currently and they all take a piece of the pie and wander off with it [...] And I*  
229 *think there's an opportunity to set up [...] a government cross agency collective that is specifically*  
230 *about food"* This dedicated ministry could address all food-related areas, from food production to  
231 the hospitality industry. The need for a national food strategy was raised alongside key policy design  
232 principles and considerations such as food-sensitive urban design, removing industry influence, Te  
233 Tiriti o Waitangi based policy, and involving young people in decision-making.

234

235

### **Behaviour change communication**

236 Of the 11 unique policies within the **behaviour change communication** policy domain, participants  
237 predominately discussed education, public awareness campaigns and classes. Topics included food  
238 waste, education on using offcuts of food, sustainable and healthy food, gardening, cooking, land  
239 use change, farming systems, re-establishing people's connection with food, and supporting local  
240 growers. For example, one participant explained the need for education on what a sustainable  
241 healthy diet is: *"I think that there needs to be probably more education on what a sustainable*  
242 *healthy diet actually is. It should be included [...] in the healthy eating and activity guidelines because*  
243 *there's not much [...] there. It's more about [...], you need to eat this much of the stuff of food, but*

244 *not really talking about where the food is coming from and taking that into consideration.” There*  
245 *was an emphasis on linking other policies to education. Another participant discussed the links*  
246 *between education, access and affordability of food: “[...] things like bringing things closer to people*  
247 *[...] feeds into education and feeds into access to food or feed into the cost [...]”.*

248

249 The importance of community engagement and a bottom-up approach to ensure buy-in of affected  
250 communities was discussed. This involved participants suggesting that the content and  
251 implementation of the policies were culturally appropriate by recognising the role of food in  
252 communities and centering their values. One participant described this as balancing cultural values  
253 with improving food waste, for example: *“And this is where we’re conflicted because we have a*  
254 *perception that to manaaki our whānau we need to have an abundance. [...]. But that needs to be*  
255 *balanced out...”*

256

## 257 Discussion

258

### 259 Main findings

260 Policies suggested by contributors predominately focused on the food system (especially production  
261 systems) and had a strong local and community focus, particularly on children and young people.  
262 This food system focus aligns with the large influence agriculture has on contributing to the  
263 environment compared to other sectors within Aotearoa NZ.<sup>5,13</sup> Food environment policies looked at  
264 supermarkets and food retail, farming and local food environments, food industry regulations and  
265 government standards and regulations. Food system policies were directed towards food waste,  
266 local food production, supporting sustainable and healthy farming practices, facilitating land use  
267 change, and systematic policies such as within central government. The behaviour change  
268 communication policies centered education with public awareness campaigns, and classes within  
269 each policy domain.

270 Most policies targeting the food system appear to suggest a general agreement among our  
271 contributors on the government’s responsibility for delivering more sustainable kai in Aotearoa NZ.  
272 This aligns with previous research engaging with contributors and communities about food policy in  
273 Aotearoa NZ, for key issues of food insecurity and the right to food for Indigenous children  
274 guaranteed by the government.<sup>31-34</sup> This general agreement of the states’ responsibility is  
275 particularly high among the public in Aotearoa NZ compared to other countries, with New  
276 Zealanders demonstrating the highest agreement of the government’s responsibility for food policy  
277 (70%) than any other country.<sup>35</sup> The focus of food system policies and particularly production  
278 systems by the contributors in our project was similarly found in other studies involving engagement  
279 with agri-food contributors (e.g. farmers, food producers, advisors etc.) on sustainable food  
280 systems.<sup>36,37</sup> Skills and competencies considered by agri-food contributors worldwide for  
281 transitioning towards sustainable food systems included a “system perspective” which was reflected  
282 in the policies generated by our participants.<sup>34</sup>

283 The focus on production systems was reflected by a similar project in Iowa, America where sixteen  
284 organisations in the agricultural, environmental non-governmental organisations, federal and state  
285 agencies, and research organisations suggested policies for improving agro-ecosystem outcomes.<sup>36</sup>  
286 Of the suggested policies, 64% were associated with land management, with examples of rewarding  
287 more sustainable farming practices and making such management practices mandatory to mitigate  
288 negative externalities.<sup>36</sup> These suggested policies were similar to those raised by contributors on our  
289 project and are unsurprising given the focus on land use and dominance of food production in the  
290 Aotearoa NZ economy. Contributors in Larsen et al. (2019) identified land use planning and

289 targeted conservation as key areas to help improve environmental outcomes with agriculture, which  
290 were similar to ideas held by our participants.<sup>36</sup> Bastian and Coveney (2011) also had similar food  
291 system-level policies such as land planning policies suggested by their contributors involved in  
292 improving food security in Australia.<sup>33</sup>

293 The strong local and community focus of all interventions suggested across the three policy domains  
294 is reflected in other studies when asking contributors about their perceptions of a sustainable food  
295 system.<sup>38</sup> Garcia-Gonzalez and Eakin (2019)<sup>38</sup> looked at contributor perspectives in education,  
296 community building, production, distribution, policy development, waste management and  
297 processing sectors for example. Their definition of a sustainable food system included key aspects  
298 such as “local food activities”.<sup>38</sup> Further, their participants discussed the role of Arizona as a large  
299 food-producing area that failed to prioritise local communities over exports. This was a similar  
300 theme among contributors in our project and their perceptions of Aotearoa NZ. As one of their  
301 participants stated, “*You can buy products at farmers markets but there needs to be policies and*  
302 *programs that make it possible for change to occur at a larger scale*” (p.74).<sup>38</sup>

303 Within this strong local and community focus were key policies situated in settings such as schools,  
304 community events, and local gardens, highlighting the needs of children and young people.  
305 Participants in Garcia-Gonzalez and Eakin (2019) also had this focus as “improve food  
306 access/distribution” and “edible landscape/gardening” were two top characteristics in their outline  
307 of a sustainable food system.<sup>37</sup> One participant in their study explained “*Every school should have a*  
308 *school garden. . . . For people to be in touch with their food we need to start with the kids. I would*  
309 *hate to give up on adults, but there is a lost generation of people who think food needs to be fast*  
310 *food.*” (p.71).<sup>38</sup>

311 There is generally limited evidence of the policies suggested by contributors on dietary consumption  
312 and environmental outcomes such as greenhouse gas emissions.<sup>39</sup> This is particularly for food  
313 system-based policies that are across sectors (agriculture, health and the environment).<sup>39</sup> Further  
314 research is required to investigate these policies and resources such as funding need to be allocated  
315 to support contributors currently implementing such policies.

316

### Limitations

317 We were able to include participants and organisations from government agencies, industry,  
318 academics, community, and rural and urban tangata whenua communities. The representation of  
319 industry and urban farmers was less strong than the other contributor groups. We invited these  
320 groups to participate similarly to other contributor groups but the invitation was not accepted as  
321 commonly. We are unsure of their reasons for not participating and do not make any assumptions  
322 about why. We note this as a limitation as their representation was less considerable than the other  
323 groups. We generally had a strong response rate as 20 individuals and 7 focus groups were initially  
324 contacted to participate in the project. As with other qualitative research, it is important to  
325 acknowledge that the representativeness of the findings is limited to those who participated.

326

### Implications

327 We have engaged with contributors across various sectors to ask for their proposed solutions to help  
328 the population transition towards healthy and sustainable diets in Aotearoa NZ. To our knowledge,  
329 this is the first study to further build on the work of the EAT-Lancet Commission by generating  
330 policies that are localised to the context of Aotearoa NZ.



331 We found that contributors proposed a range of policies that were generally targeted at the food  
332 system level, with a particular focus on production systems. There was also a strong theme of  
333 policies proposed at the government level to assist communities with creating their own solutions.  
334

### 335 **Future research**

336 Research on the effectiveness of local initiatives supporting sustainable food systems is required in  
337 terms of their impacts on health outcomes (e.g. diet-related such as fruit and vegetable intake),  
338 environmental outcomes (e.g. greenhouse gas emissions and water use), and social outcomes (e.g.  
339 social cohesion). Alongside research supporting local initiatives, researchers must work with  
340 contributors and communities in developing, implementing, or enhancing new or existing policies  
such as community gardens and promoting plant-based food for planetary and human health.

341

### **Conclusions**

342 Many policies (111) were suggested by contributors on this project across community, government,  
343 industry, academia and rural and urban tangata whenua communities. Using the NOURISHING and  
344 HLPE Food System Frameworks, policies predominately focused on food systems and specifically  
345 food production. Despite limited research on their demonstrated effectiveness in the literature, this  
346 research demonstrates that there are initiatives supporting sustainable food systems that require  
347 further resources and research. Those working in sustainable food systems policy need to support  
348 contributors and communities in developing, implementing or enhancing new or existing policies to  
349 improve the health and environmental wellbeing of people in Aotearoa NZ and globally.

350

### **Author contributions**

351 CC and CM conceptualised the study; CC, CM, BK and HE collected and analysed the data; BK  
352 compiled the first draft of the manuscript; CC,CM, BK and HE revised the manuscript.

353

### **Ethics**

354 The University of Otago Ethics Committee approved this study on 13<sup>th</sup> September 2021 (reference  
355 no D21/293).

356

### **Acknowledgements**

357 Thank you to our participants for contributing your lived experience and expertise to the project, the  
358 project advisory group, and the wider project team. This work was supported by the Healthier Lives  
359 He Oranga Hauora National Science Challenge under Grant UOOX1902.

### 360 **Declaration of interest statement**

361 The authors declare they have no conflicts of interest related to this work to disclose.


362

## References

- 363 International Food Policy Research Institute. 2022 Global food policy report: Transforming food  
364 systems after COVID-19. Washington, DC, 2021 DOI:10.2499/9780896293991.
- 365 Willett W, Rockström J, Loken B, *et al.* Food in the Anthropocene: the EAT–Lancet Commission on  
366 healthy diets from sustainable food systems. *The Lancet*. 2019; **393**: 447–92.
- 367 Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, The International Fund for Agricultural  
368 Development, World Food Programme, World Health Organization. The State of Food Security and  
369 Nutrition in the World 2021. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, 2021  
370 DOI:10.4060/cb4474en.
- 371 Tubiello FN, Karl K, Flammini A, *et al.* Pre- and post-production processes increasingly dominate  
372 greenhouse gas emissions from agri-food systems. *Earth Syst Sci Data*. 2022; **14**: 1795–809.
- 373 Ministry for the Environment. New Zealand’s Greenhouse Gas Inventory 1990-2020. 2022.
- 374 Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development. New Zealand. In: OECD, ed. Agricultural  
375 Policy Monitoring and Evaluation 2022: Reforming Agricultural Policies for Climate Change  
376 Mitigation. OECD, 2022: 1–652.
- 377 Ministry of Health. Longer, Healthier Lives: New Zealand’s Health 1990-2017. Wellington, 2020.
- 378 Ministry of Health. Annual Data Explorer 2021/22: New Zealand Health Survey [Data File]. 2022.  
379 <https://minhealthnz.shinyapps.io/nz-health-survey-2021-22-annual-data-explorer/> (accessed Jan 6,  
380 2023).
- 381 Ministry of Health. Te Tiriti o Waitangi Framework. Wellington, 2020.
- 382 Rockström J, Steffen W, Noone K, *et al.* Planetary Boundaries: Exploring the Safe Operating Space for  
383 Humanity. 2009; **14**. <https://about.jstor.org/terms> (accessed Jan 6, 2023).
- 384 Springmann M, Wiebe K, Mason-D’Croz D, Sulser TB, Rayner M, Scarborough P. Health and  
385 nutritional aspects of sustainable diet strategies and their association with environmental impacts: a  
386 global modelling analysis with country-level detail. *Lancet Planet Health* 2018; **2**: e451–61.
- 387 Tilman D, Clark M. Global diets link environmental sustainability and human health. *Nature* 2014;  
388 **515**: 518–22.
- 389 Drew J, Cleghorn C, Macmillan A, Mizdrak A. Healthy and climate-friendly eating patterns in the New  
390 Zealand context. *Environ Health Perspect* 2020; **128**. DOI:10.1289/EHP5996.
- 391 Whitmee S, Haines A, Beyrer C, *et al.* Safeguarding human health in the Anthropocene epoch: report  
392 of The Rockefeller Foundation–Lancet Commission on planetary health. *The Lancet* 2015; **386**: 1973–  
393 2028.
- 394 Green R, Milner J, Dangour AD, *et al.* The potential to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the UK  
395 through healthy and realistic dietary change. *Clim Change* 2015; **129**: 253–65.
- 396 Van Dooren C, Tyszler M, Kramer GFH, Aiking H. Combining low price, low climate impact and high  
397 nutritional value in one shopping basket through diet optimization by linear programming.  
398 *Sustainability* 2015; **7**: 12837–55.

- ~~399~~ 399 Vieux F, Perignon M, Gazan R, Darmon N. Dietary changes needed to improve diet sustainability: are they similar across Europe? *Eur J Clin Nutr* 2018; **72**: 951–60.  
400
- ~~401~~ 401 Gephart JA, Davis KF, Emery KA, Leach AM, Galloway JN, Pace ML. The environmental cost of  
402 subsistence: optimizing diets to minimize footprints. *Science of the Total Environment* 2016; **553**:  
403 120–7.
- ~~404~~ 404 Clark MA, Springmann M, Hill J, Tilman D. Multiple health and environmental impacts of foods.  
405 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 2019; **116**: 23357–62.
- ~~406~~ 406 Centre for Food Policy at City University of London, Results for Development. Taking a Food Systems  
407 Approach to Policymaking: A Resource for Policymakers. London, UK and Washington D.C, 2022.
- ~~408~~ 408 Warren AM, Constantinides S v., Blake CE, Frongillo EA. Advancing knowledge about stakeholder  
409 engagement in multisectoral nutrition research. *Glob Food Sec* 2021; **29**.  
410 DOI:10.1016/J.GFS.2021.100521.
- ~~421~~ 421 Alliance of Bioversity, CIAT, United Nations Environment Programme, World Wildlife Fund. National  
412 and Subnational Food Systems Multi-Stakeholder Mechanisms: an assessment of experiences. 2021  
413 [https://spaces.oneplanetnetwork.org/system/files/strategy\\_one\\_planet.pdf](https://spaces.oneplanetnetwork.org/system/files/strategy_one_planet.pdf).
- ~~424~~ 424 Nguyen B, Cranney L, Bellew B, Thomas M. Implementing food environment policies at scale: What  
415 helps? what hinders? a systematic review of barriers and enablers. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*.  
416 2021; **18**. DOI:10.3390/ijerph181910346.
- ~~427~~ 427 Healthier Lives. Sustainable New Zealand diets - Healthier Lives. University of Otago. 2022.  
418 <https://healthierlives.co.nz/research/sustainable-nz-diets/> (accessed Jan 9, 2023).
- ~~429~~ 429 Morley, J., Machado, C, C, V., Burr, C., Cowls, J., Indra, J., Taddeo, M., Floridi, L. The ethics of AI in  
420 health care: A mapping review. *Social Science & Medicine*. 2020; **260**: 113172.  
421 DOI:10.1016/j.socscimed.2020.113172
- ~~422~~ 422 Enright, J., Anderson, A., Jansen, R., Murray, J., Brewer, K., Selak, V. (2021). Iwi (tribal) data collection  
423 at a primary health care organisation in Aotearoa. *JPHC*. 2021; **13**(1): 36-43.
- ~~424~~ 424 Kukutai, T., Taylor, J. Indigenous Data Sovereignty: Toward an agenda. ANU Press. 2016; **38**.  
425 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1q1crgf>.
- ~~426~~ 426 Braun, V., Clarke, V. Ten fundamentals of qualitative research. In Braun & Clarke (Eds.), *Successful*  
427 *qualitative research: a practical guide for beginners* (1st Ed. pp. 19 40). SAGE Publications. 2013.
- ~~428~~ 428 Hawkes C, Jewell J, Allen K. A food policy package for healthy diets and the prevention of obesity and  
429 diet-related non-communicable diseases: The NOURISHING framework. *Obesity Reviews* 2013; **14**:  
430 159–68.
- ~~431~~ 431 High Level Panel of Experts on Food Security. Nutrition and food systems. A report by the High Level  
432 Panel of Experts on Food Security and Nutrition of the Committee on World Food Security. Rome,  
433 2017 [www.fao.org/cfs/cfs-hlpe](http://www.fao.org/cfs/cfs-hlpe).
- ~~434~~ 434 Reynolds D, Miroso M. Understandings of food insecurity in aotearoa New Zealand: Considering  
435 practitioners' perspectives in a neoliberal context using q methodology. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*  
436 2022; **14**. DOI:10.3390/su14010178.

- 437 McKerchar C, Lacey C, Abel G, Signal L. Ensuring the right to food for indigenous children: a case  
438 study of stakeholder perspectives on policy options to ensure the rights of tamariki Māori to healthy  
439 food. *Int J Equity Health* 2021; **20**. DOI:10.1186/s12939-021-01407-4.
- 440 Bastian A, Coveney J. Local evidenced-based policy options to improve food security in South  
441 Australia: The use of local knowledge in policy development. *Public Health Nutr* 2012; **15**: 1497–502.
- 442 Mackay S, Gerritsen S, Sing F, Vandevijvere S, Swinburn B. Implementing healthy food environment  
443 policies in New Zealand: nine years of inaction. *Health Res Policy Syst* 2022; **20**. DOI:10.1186/s12961-  
444 021-00809-8.
- 445 Pinho-Gomes AC, Booth L, Pettigrew S. Public perceptions of responsibility for recommended food  
446 policies in seven countries. *Eur J Public Health* 2023; **33**: 299–304.
- 447 Larsen D, Tyndall JC, Schulte LA, Grudens-Schuck N. Exploring Stakeholder Consensus for Multiple  
448 Outcomes in Agriculture: An Iowa Case Study. *Front Sustain Food Syst* 2019; **3**.  
449 DOI:10.3389/fsufs.2019.00110.
- 450 Rastorgueva N, Lindner LF, Hansen SR, Migliorini P, Knöbl CF, Flynn KM. Views of Farmers and Other  
451 Agri-Food Stakeholders on Generic Skills for Transitioning toward Sustainable Food Systems.  
452 *Agronomy* 2023; **13**. DOI:10.3390/agronomy13020525.
- 453 Garcia-Gonzalez J, Eakin H. What Can Be: Stakeholder Perspectives for a Sustainable Food System. *J*  
454 *Agric Food Syst Community Dev* 2019; 1–22.
- 455 Reynolds AN, Mhurchu CN, Kok ZY, Cleghorn C. The neglected potential of red and processed meat  
456 replacement with alternative protein sources: Simulation modelling and systematic review.  
457 *EClinicalMedicine* 2023; **56**. DOI:10.1016/j.eclim.2022.101774.



- Storage and distribution
- Retail and markets
- Production systems
- Processing and packaging
- General



## Food environments



## Increasing incomes

"[...] income is one of the main determinants of how people eat. How much healthy food they can afford, and we have a housing crisis [...] So I think if you're thinking about barriers to sustainable food, the cost of living, that is probably quite important."



## Shelf placement interventions

"[...] thinking about how they look, just whether but [...] have made that space is quite to certain foods? [...] I've still started that a while ago is dedicated to sale [...] the front is not considered to be more important."



## Healthy food and drink policies in schools/kurs

"[...] with the schools, like how we have the public health units out there trying to get healthy food and drink policies in place so that when kids go to school, they have access to healthy food and water."



## Incorporate sustainability into guidelines

"[...] thinking about that is certainly quite a good measure [...] in terms of its direct effect on diets, [...] but having a more powerful influence on [...] making a strong statement by the Ministry of Health that [...] signals [...] in the food production industry that this is [...] where we're going."



## Establish a Ministry of Food

"[...] think we absolutely need a Ministry of Food [...] it would be really important to shift our whole thinking, the government and the public's thinking from focusing on the food [...] all-year effort to 'making great food, sustainable food products' as well as a global commodity"

## Review pesticides and herbicides laws

"[...] we've got a problem and this is the step that is the way for us, in the pesticides and herbicides that are being used, and there's some [...] good understanding that are coming through on that, it's been 20 years and we're [...] the food from us."



## Rewarding farmers for sustainable practices

"[...] specific agricultural sector groups have a vested interest in their products being recognised for being [...] better than average. However, sometimes what that signals is the idea of separating between produce that's different from [...] [...] [...] [...]"



## Composting service

"[...] the fact that the people do seem to have a composting service [...] sustainability day. That's one of the things for bringing things down to people that are in the educational field into some food [...]"



## Food system



## Behaviour Change Communication



## Education on healthy sustainable diets

"[...] think that there needs to be probably more education, so what a sustainable healthy diet actually is. [...] it's important [...] [...] in the healthy eating and energy guidelines because there's not much [...] there"



## Funding community cooking workshops

"[...] bringing back the old farm activities, learning how to make a white soup, [...] preserve all these plants, [...] That's what I do now, because I run given the gift of being down here to, but so many people don't know."



## Education on using offcuts of food

"[...] things that are perhaps on TV or magazines or whether they food all about and stuff [...] using food, you don't use the green bit of carrot, you can use the green bit of [...] you can use the whole of the vegetable, [...] promoting things that that will help minimise waste?"



## Re-establish people's connection with food

"[...] I think there are things that you establish a link of [...] reestablished an people's connection with food through growing and sharing one of the best of food system in our communities that connects around food, you know [...] [...] those ways in which people come food there are?"

```
graph LR; A((Interview and/or focus group held)) --> B((Review and confirm transcript)); B --> C((Record mentioned policy and associating detail)); C --> D((Refine list of policies));
```

Interview  
and/or focus  
group held

Review and  
confirm  
transcript

Record  
mentioned  
policy and  
associating  
detail

Refine list of  
policies

NOURISHING Framework		HLPE Food System Framework
Domain	Policy Area	Alignment with NOURSHING
<b>Food environment</b>	N Nutrition label standards and regulations on the use of claims and implied claims on foods	-
	O Offer healthy foods and set standards in public institutions and other specific settings	-
	U Use economic tools to address food affordability and purchase incentives	-
	R Restrict food advertising and other forms of commercial promotion	-
	I Improve the quality of the food supply	-
	S Set incentives and rules to create a healthy retail environment	-
<b>Food system</b>	H Harness supply chain and actions across sectors to ensure coherence with health	Production systems
		Storage and distribution
		Processing and packaging
		Retail and markets
<b>Behaviour change communication</b>	I Inform people about food and nutrition through public awareness	-
	N Nutrition advice and counselling in health care settings	-
	G Give nutrition education and skills	-

*Adapted from Figure 1 Hawkes C, Jewell J, Allen K (2013)<sup>29</sup> and Figure 3 HLPE (2017)<sup>30</sup>*



