



Diagnosing Policy Coherence for Food Systems Toolkit – Scoring Guide

Note

This document is intended to accompany Modules 1 and 2 of the Food Systems Policy Coherence Diagnostic Tool.. It contains scoring guides for both modules. Those modules are provided in a separate document on <https://www.gainhealth.org/policy-coherence-toolkit..> That website also contains the User's Manual for the tool, with additional guidance on how to apply the scoring and use the results.

Acknowledgements

This tool was developed through GAIN's Nourishing Food Pathways programme, which is jointly funded by:



Co-funded by
the European Union



Irish Aid
An Roinn Gnóthaí Eachtracha
Department of Foreign Affairs



Ministry of Foreign Affairs



Schweizerische Eidgenossenschaft
Confédération suisse
Confederazione Svizzera
Confederaziun svizra

Swiss Agency for Development
and Cooperation SDC

The findings, ideas, and conclusions presented in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect positions or policies of any of the agencies mentioned above.

The work was led by Jamie Morrison and Stella Nordhagen from GAIN and Mahamadou Tankari and Julie Collins from AKADEMIYA2063. We thank the members of the advisory group for their contributions to the development of the tool: Koen Deconinck (OECD), Kelly Parsons (University of Cambridge), Danielle Resnick (IFPRI), and José Valls Bedeau (FAO). And we thank those who applied the tool in the initial applications: Cognitia Strategi Indonesia, Assogba Hodonou, Derbew Kefyalew, Niamh Kelly, Prudence Lugendo, Timothy Njagi, Evans Osabuohien, Sergio Ponguane, Nidhi Ralhan, Syed Irshad Ali Shah, and Ese Urhie, as well as the GAIN policy advisors who supported the work: Joyce Akpata, Diva Dessai, Aboua Leonce Dossou, Genet Gebremedhin, Supreet Kaur, Faiz Rasool, Aang Sutrisna. We also thank additional AKADEMIYA2063 staff and consultants who contributed to the tool, Babra Akello, Fatima Kareem, and Wondwosen Tefera, and GAIN staff who reviewed sections of it, Anthony Wennedt, Valentine Granet, and Oliver Camp. The layout was designed by Yusuf Mustapha. All photographs included in this document have been taken with consent for use in publications.

Recommended citation

GAIN & AKADEMIYA2063. 2025. Food Systems Policy Coherence Diagnostic Tool: Scoring Guide. Geneva: GAIN.

Contents

Annex 1: Module 1 Scoring Guide	01
Domain 1: Framework Documents	01
Domain 2: Political Commitment	03
Domain 3: Capacity and Implementation	04
Domain 4: Governmental Coordination Structures	05
Domain 5: Inclusivity, Stakeholder Engagement, and Voice	06
Domain 6: Monitoring and Accountability	07
 Annex 2: Module 2 Scoring Guide	 10
Agricultural Policy and Instruments	10
Health / Nutrition Policy and Instruments	22
Environmental Policy and Instruments	28
Trade Policy and Instruments	35
Social Affairs Policy and Instruments (Social Protection, Labor, Women's Empowerment, Etc.)	44
Industrial, Economic Growth, and Monetary Policies and instruments	51

Annex 1: Module 1 Scoring Guide

The tables below demonstrate the suggested scoring approach for Module 1, by Domain. Aggregate scores are generated as follows: High = maximum value for that domain; the remaining score range (i.e., Maximum Value – 1) is divided into three and assigned by thirds to Moderately High, Moderately Low, and Low. Where this does not result in an equal range for each of those three scores, the largest range should go to 'Low', then 'Moderately Low', rounding to 0.5.

Domain 1: Framework Documents			
	Question / Answer	Score	Recommendation
1	Does the country have a “Food System Pathway” document submitted via the United Nations Food System Summit (UNFSS) process (including those submitted after the 2021 UNFSS itself) or another national-level, high-level document (strategy, policy, plan) that presents a vision and action priorities or plans for food or the food system as a whole, going beyond sectoral policies?		
	Yes, a document submitted through the UNFSS process	3	No recommendation; criterion met!
	Yes, a document not submitted through the UNFSS process	3	Consider submitting the document through the UNFSS process
	No	0	Consider developing such a document and potentially submitting it through the UNFSS process
2	Does that pathway/strategy consider multiple food system domains (e.g., agriculture, health/nutrition, trade, environment, livelihoods/labour, education)?		
	Yes, a comprehensive set of food system domains (over 3 of those named above), with clear linkages and connections (e.g., synergies and trade-offs) articulated among them	3	No recommendation; criterion met!
	Yes, a comprehensive set of food system domains (over 3 of those named above), but with those domains generally described separately ('siloed')	2	Consider revising the document to make clear the linkages between the domains
	Partially, covering 2-3 of those named above, with clear linkages and connections (e.g., synergies and trade-offs) articulated among them	2	Consider expanding the scope of the document to cover a larger set of domains
	Partially, covering 2-3 of those named above, but with those domains generally described separately ('siloed')	1	Consider expanding the scope of the document to cover a larger set of domains and revising the document to make clear the linkages between the domains
	No, it only considers one domain	0	
3	Does the pathway/strategy include a vision for the future of the national food system (e.g., by 2030)?		
	Yes, a specific vision with a specific date for achieving it is provided	3	No recommendation; criterion met!
	Partially, some vision is provided but it lacks details or achievement date	1.5	Consider making the vision more detailed and adding specific achievement dates [specifics to be provided by the person completing the tool]
	No, there is no vision for the future	0	Consider articulating a vision for the future of the national food system

	Question / Answer	Score	Recommendation
4	Does the pathway/strategy document lay out priorities for change (i.e., specific issues within the food system that are the most important to address) and concrete targets associated with those changes?		
	Yes, specific objectives/priorities are laid out, with it being clear which are more important or urgent than others, and most or all of these are connected to specific targets	3	No recommendation; criterion met!
	Partial: some objectives/priorities are named, but most are missing target	2	Consider greater prioritisation of the issues to address within the food system and/or including specific targets for achievement [specifics to be provided by the person completing the tool]
	Partial: some objectives/priorities are named, but there are no targets at all	1	
	No, no objectives/ priorities are named	0	Consider adding mention of specific priority issues to address, with targets
5	Does the pathway/strategy lay out measures or interventions (i.e., specific actions that should be taken to address the issues named)?		
	Yes, nearly all issues are associated with specific measures or interventions	3	No recommendation; criterion met!
	Partially, some issues are associated with specific measures or interventions	1.5	Consider adding specific measures or interventions for those issues that lack them [specifics to be provided by the person completing the tool]
	No specific measures or interventions are named.	0	Consider adding mention of specific measures or interventions
6	Was the pathway/strategy document developed through the input of multiple different types of food systems stakeholders and/or sectors?		
	Yes, stakeholders of at least six different types and from at least three food system domains were involved	3	No recommendation; criterion met!
	Partial (1), stakeholders of at least three different types and from at least three food system domains were involved	2	In revisions of the document, or future work based on it, aim to include a wider range of sectors and/or stakeholders
	Partial (2), different stakeholders and/or sectors were involved, but not meeting the thresholds in (a) or (b)	1	
	No, the document was developed by only one sector and only one stakeholder type	0	In revisions of the document, or future work based on it, aim to include a wider range of sectors and/or stakeholders (high priority)
	Unclear / no documentation available	NA	Exclude from scoring.
	Overall score for Domain: Add up individual scores for all 5 questions: 18 = High; 12-17.5 = Moderately high; 6.5-12 = Moderately low; 0-6 = Low. [if any questions are excluded as NA, adjust ranges downward by the maximum score for the excluded question(s)]		

Domain 2: Political Commitment			
	Question / Answer	Score	Recommendation
1	Did the country express high-level commitment to the pathway/strategy (i.e., by a Minister, President/Prime Minister, or Vice President/Deputy Minister) through a statement before or during the UNFSS?		
	Yes	3	No recommendation; criterion met! (Skip next question)
	No	0	Consider seeking an opportunity for high-level commitment as part of the future UNFSS stock-taking or similar high-profile events.
	No pathway exists	0	Consider developing a pathway; once it has been developed, consider seeking an opportunity for high-level commitment to it.
2	If not, has high-level commitment to the pathway/strategy, or to a food systems approach in general, been expressed in another forum since 2015?		
	Yes, to a specific pathway/strategy document (encompassing a food systems approach)	3	No recommendation; criterion met!
	Yes, to a food systems approach in general (but not a specific pathway/strategy document)	1.5	Consider seeking an opportunity for expressing high-level commitment to a more specific pathway or strategy, as this may be more supporting of accountability than to a more vague 'approach'.
	No	0	Consider seeking opportunities for expressing high-level commitment to either a food systems approach or a specific pathway/strategy.
	Not Applicable – question skipped due to 'yes' to Q1	NA	Exclude from scoring.
3	Are there any provisions or mechanisms to promote sustained commitment to a food systems approach beyond electoral cycles or government terms?		
	Yes, the incoming administration signing off on the pathway/strategy	3	No recommendation; criterion met!
	Yes, the pathway/strategy was included in the party platform or election manifesto	3	
	Yes, other (specify)	2	
	No	0	Consider establishing mechanisms to promote sustained commitment to a food systems approach beyond electoral cycles or government terms, such as through the pathway/strategy being signed off by the new administration, including the pathway/strategy/action plan in the party platform or election manifesto, by having key food systems staff who are not political appointees and thus remain in their roles regardless of election cycles
	Not Applicable – no recent election / change in government	NA	Exclude from scoring.
Overall score for Domain: Add up individual scores for all 3 questions: 6 = High; 4-5.5 = Moderately High, 2-3.5 = Moderately Low, 0-2 = Low.. [if any questions are excluded as NA, adjust ranges downward by the maximum score for the excluded question(s)]			

Domain 3: Capacity and Implementation			
	Question / Answer	Score	Recommendation
1	Has the pathway/strategy been formally adopted or ratified politically, according to the government's process?		
	Yes	3	No recommendation; criterion met!
	No, but the process is in course or initiated	2	Continue pursuing the process for formally adopting/ratifying the pathway/strategy
	No, and no process to do so is in course or initiated	0	Initiate the process for formally adopting/ratifying the pathway/strategy
	No pathway exists	0	Consider developing a pathway; once it has been developed, initiate the process for formally adopting/ratifying it
2	Has an action plan that sets out required policy changes and investments to operationalise the pathway/strategy been developed?		
	Yes	3	No recommendation; criterion met!
	No, but the process is in course or initiated	2	Continue pursuing the process for developing the action plan
	No, and no process to do so is in course or initiated	0	Initiate the process for developing an action plan.
	No pathway exists	0	Consider developing a pathway; once it has been developed, develop an action plan
3	Have the priorities laid out in the pathway/strategy and/or action plan (if developed) been incorporated into national policies, strategies, and plans or are they based on/referencing preexisting national policies, strategies, and plans?		
	Yes, in more than 3 sectors	3	No recommendation; criterion met!
	Yes in 1 – 3 sectors	2	Seek opportunities to incorporate the pathway/strategy/action plan into additional sectors
	No, but the process is in course or initiated	1.5	Continue pursuing the process for incorporating it into national strategies/policies/plans
	No, and no process to do so is in course or initiated	0	Initiate the process for incorporating it into national strategies/policies/plans
	No pathway exists	0	Consider developing a pathway; once it has been developed, consider incorporating it into national strategies/policies/plans
4	Is there a costed investment plan or budget to support the implementation of the pathway?		
	Yes	3	No recommendation; criterion met!
	No, but the process is in course or initiated	2	Continue pursuing the process for developing the investment plan or budget
	Partially (i.e., budget or investment to cover parts but not all)	2	Consider creating a more comprehensive investment plan or budget to make sure all aspects of the pathway are funded

	Question / Answer	Score	Recommendation
	No, and no process to do so is in course or initiated	0	Initiate the process for developing the investment plan or budget
	No pathway exists	NA	Consider developing a pathway; once it has been developed, develop an associated investment plan or budget.
5	Is/Are there a plan(s) or structure(s) (either internal to or external to the government) to support capacity building of government staff across sectors on key topics related to 'food systems' and integrated food systems approaches?		
	Yes, in more than 3 sectors	3	No recommendation; criterion met!
	Yes in 1 – 3 sectors	2	Seek opportunities to extend capacity building to other sectors
	No, but the process is in course or initiated	1.5	Continue pursuing the process of staff capacity building
	No, and no process to do so is in course or initiated	0	Consider developing a plan and structures to support capacity building of government staff across sectors on food systems approaches
	Overall score for Domain: Add up individual scores for all 5 questions: 15 = High; 10.5-14.5 = Moderately High; 5.5-10 = Moderately Low; 0-5 = Low. [if any questions are excluded as NA, adjust ranges downward by the maximum score for the excluded question(s)]		

Domain 4: Governmental Coordination Structures			
	Question / Answer	Score	Recommendation
1	Is there a lead government institution or individual responsible for food systems transformation?		
	Yes, outside a sectoral ministry	3	No recommendation; criterion met!
	Yes, under the oversight of a sectoral minister	2	Consider whether there are opportunities for moving this post to be outside of a sectoral ministry, such as under the oversight of the executive, where it may have more cross-sectoral visibility and/or authority that within a sectoral ministry
	No	0	Consider creating such a position / institution
2	Is there an ongoing national-level platform or forum (e.g., interdepartmental taskforce, committee, council, meeting, conference) to promote dialogue and coordination within government across sectors/ministries/agencies on food systems topics, broadly encompassing food systems?		
	Yes	3	No recommendation; criterion met!
	No	0	Consider creating such a platform/ forum

	Question / Answer	Score	Recommendation
3	Is there an ongoing national-level platform or forum (e.g., interdepartmental taskforce, committee, council, meeting, conference) to promote dialogue and coordination within government across sectors/ministries/agencies on a specific food system topic or goal?		
	Yes	2	No recommendation; criterion met!
	No	0	Consider creating such a platform/ forum for top-priority goals
4	Are there designated champions or advocates for a coherent food systems approach embedded within different government departments/agencies?		
	Yes, multiple across many departments/agencies	2	No recommendation; criterion met!
	Yes, but only in one or two departments/agencies	1	Consider identifying and empowering a wider range of champions
	No	0	Consider identifying and empowering such individuals
5	Are there any provisions or mechanisms in place to engage different levels of government, such as city, state, and subnational regions, in food systems policy?		
	In place, functioning and comprehensive	3	No recommendation; criterion met!
	Partial	1.5	Pursue the full implementation of this mechanism
	No	0	Consider creating such a mechanism
	Overall score for Domain: Add up individual scores for all 5 questions: 13 = High; 9-12.5 = Moderately high; 4.5-8.5 = moderately low; 0 – 4 = Low		

Domain 5: Inclusivity, Stakeholder Engagement, and Voice

	Question / Answer	Score	Recommendation
1	Did the country organise Food System Summit Dialogues in the run-up to the 2021 UNFSS? If so, did these Dialogues include stakeholders from multiple groups among: businesses and workers; farmers; NGOs and foundations; Indigenous Peoples; science and academia; government; and consumer groups?		
	Yes, dialogue(s) were held and included participants from at least 5 of these 7 different groups.	3	No recommendation; criterion met!
	Yes, dialogue(s) were held and included participants from 2-4 of these different groups.	2	In the future, seek opportunities to make Dialogues and other types of consultations around food systems more inclusive of different groups
	Yes, dialogue(s) were held but they either did not include participants from different groups, or no information was available on participants.	1.5	
	No, no dialogue was held	0	In the future, seek opportunities to hold Dialogues and other types of consultations around food systems

	Question / Answer	Score	Recommendation
2	Are there mechanisms in place for consulting non-governmental technical/scientific experts on food system policies that cut across different sectors?		
	Yes, clear process of technical consultation is in place, and it deliberately aims to include experts from different sectors in the process	3	No recommendation; criterion met!
	Yes, clear process of technical consultation is in place, but without explicit cross-sectoral focus	2	Consider adding an explicit cross-sectoral aspect to existing technical consultation process
	No	0	Consider putting in place such mechanisms
3	Are there mechanisms in place for consulting non-governmental, non-scientific stakeholders (e.g., citizens, civil society groups, private sector groups) on policy questions and feeding their inputs into food systems policymaking or decision making?		
	Yes, including diverse stakeholder groups	3	No recommendation; criterion met!
	Yes, but only with only narrow stakeholder participation	1.5	Consider widening the participation of different types of stakeholders in these consultations
	No	0	Consider putting in place such mechanisms
	Overall score for Domain: Add up individual scores for all 3 questions: 9 = High; 6.5-8.5 = moderately high; 4-6 = moderately low; 0-3 = low		

Domain 6: Monitoring and Accountability

	Question / Answer	Score	Recommendation
1	Does the pathway/strategy document or the action/implementation plan based on it (see Section 1) include key performance indicators (KPIs)?		
	Yes	3	No recommendation; criterion met!
	Partial	1.5	Expand the KPIs to be more comprehensive
	No	0	Consider adding KPIs to the document in the future
	No pathway exists	0	Consider developing a pathway; once it has been developed, consider including KPIs in it.
2	Are there domestic milestones or dates and mechanisms for review and reporting on progress of the implementation of the food system pathway/strategy?		
	Yes, both	3	No recommendation; criterion met!
	Yes, milestones but no mechanisms	2	Consider adding reporting mechanisms to the document in the future
	Yes, mechanisms but no milestones	2	Consider adding reporting milestones to the document in the future

	Question / Answer	Score	Recommendation
	No	0	Consider adding reporting milestones and mechanisms to the document in the future
3	Are there clear responsibilities for who should conduct the monitoring and reporting on progress of the implementation of the food system pathway/strategy?		
	Yes	3	No recommendation; criterion met!
	No	0	Consider elaborating responsibilities for monitoring and reporting on progress of the implementation of the food system pathway/strategy
4	Are there clear mechanisms for making the monitoring/reporting participatory among non-governmental organisations, such as by including non-governmental stakeholders' views as an input into the monitoring or by sharing the results of the monitoring/reporting with them for feedback?		
	Yes, both	3	No recommendation; criterion met!
	Yes, inclusion of stakeholders' views in monitoring/reporting process	2	Consider also obtaining stakeholders' feedback on results of monitoring/reporting process
	Yes, obtaining stakeholders' feedback on results of monitoring/reporting process	2	Consider also including stakeholders' views in monitoring/reporting process
	No	0	Consider putting in place such mechanisms
5	Does the government provide any methods or tools to assess the potential impacts of policy, laws or regulations on different parts of the food system (i.e., their synergies and trade-offs), such as check-lists or regulatory impact assessments?		
	Yes, mandatory and with explicit inclusion of cross-sectoral impacts (synergies and trade-offs)	3	No recommendation; criterion met!
	Yes, mandatory but without explicit inclusion of cross-sectoral impacts	2	Consider adding methods or tools for explicit inclusion of cross-sectoral impacts
	Yes, optional and with explicit inclusion of cross-sectoral impacts	2	Consider making the use of these methods or tools mandatory, at least in certain cases
	Yes, optional but without explicit inclusion of cross-sectoral impacts	1.5	Consider making the use of these methods or tools mandatory, at least in certain cases, and adding methods or tools for explicit inclusion of cross-sectoral impacts
	No	0	Consider developing such methods or tools
6	Is the relevant food pathway/strategy document subject to regular review and revision (e.g., through a review clause)?		
	Yes, with review period clearly specified	3	No recommendation; criterion met!
	Yes, but without review period being clearly specified	2	Consider specifying a clear review period
	No	0	Consider making the document clearly subject to regular review and revision, with a clear review period specified

	Question / Answer	Score	Recommendation
7	Are there structures, projects, or plans to build capacity or tools in the public service to collect and analyse evidence about the impacts of different policies?		
	Yes, specific to food systems	3	No recommendation; criterion met!
	Yes, but not specific to food systems	2	Consider making these capacity-building approaches / tools specific to food systems
	No	0	Consider making plans or putting in place structures/projects to build capacity/develop tools
8	Have any results of monitoring progress on food system transformation (e.g., updated levels of key indicators) been publicly reported?		
	Yes, on a reasonably comprehensive set of relevant indicators	3	No recommendation; criterion met!
	Partial:	1.5	Make monitoring reporting more comprehensive to include a broad set of KPIs
	No	0	Ensure monitoring is undertaken and results published regularly, covering a comprehensive range of key indicators
	No pathway exists	0	Consider developing a pathway; once it has been developed, put in place plans to monitor and report on results towards achieving it
	Overall score for Domain: Add up individual scores for all 8 questions: 24 = High; 17-23.5 = moderately high; 8.5-16.5 = moderately low; 0-8 = low. Old version, without Q8: 21 = High; 14-20.5 = moderately high; 5.5-13.5 = moderately low; 0-5 = low.. [if any questions are excluded as NA, adjust ranges downward by the maximum score for the excluded question(s)]		

Annex 2: Module 2 Scoring Guide

For each selected answer, an appraisal associated with that response is indicated (Reinforcing, Conflicting, or Neutral). In cases where the user wishes to use numeric scoring (see User's Manual), a numeric score is also given. This is followed by a generic potential recommendation (for conflicting and/or neutral responses) and in some cases a potential trade-off (i.e., a negative consequence for another goal to a policy that is reinforcing of the goal being analysed). Trade-offs also include some discussion of potential mitigating actions. Trade-offs flag only some of the most obvious and common trade-offs and should not be seen as exhaustive; users should reflect on any other key trade-offs that may occur in their context and consider flagging those in their reporting.

All recommendations and trade-offs (and their mitigating actions) are generic and will not apply in all cases; users should see these as a starting point for crafting their own, context-specific recommendations.

More guidance on aggregating and presenting scores for Module 2 is given in the User's Manual.

Agricultural Policy and Instruments

Goal 1.1: Increased Supply of Main Staple Crops				
#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
1	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider funding agricultural R&D dedicated to crop breeding of the main staple crops to increase productivity.
2	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider support for extension services, agricultural information services, and/or skills training for staple crop producers. Programmes should include monitoring and evaluation plans to ensure that performance can be assessed and improved.
3	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider providing support for the provision of financial services to producers of main staple crops in order to facilitate use of inputs and productivity-enhancing investments.
4	Yes	Reinforcing	2	T: Expansion of irrigation can result in excessive and unsustainable water use, causing negative impacts such as water scarcity, reduced water quality, and soil erosion. Irrigation expansion projects should include analyses of impacts on water use. Consider efforts to decrease excessive water use associated with irrigation, such as support for increasing irrigation efficiency or extension services to promote optimal application of irrigation water. Consider complementary efforts to promote water conservation such as rainwater harvesting.
				Expansion of irrigation can also increase risks of vector-borne diseases. Irrigation expansion projects should include complementary efforts to mitigate risks of vector-borne disease, such as support for integrated pest and vector management.

#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider providing support for the expansion, operation, or maintenance of irrigation for staple crop production. In addition to large-scale irrigation, consider the potential for small-scale irrigation technologies.
5	Yes	Reinforcing	2	T: Support for access to synthetic fertilisers and pesticides can have negative ramifications for environmental pollution. Consider complementary approaches to increasing the use of inputs, e.g. soil mapping to better understand nutrient needs or increases in soil fertility to increase fertiliser use efficiency. Support for staple crops can also shift incentives towards producing them and away from producing more nutritious crops, potentially undermining achievement of goals related to improved diet quality. Review efficiency of spending and potential impacts of subsidies targeted to staple crops on more nutrient-rich foods. Consider rebalancing subsidies between staples and more nutritious foods over time.
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider funding agricultural R&D dedicated to crop breeding of the main staple crops to increase productivity.
6	Yes	Reinforcing	2	T: Price support for staple crops can shift incentives towards producing them and away from producing more nutritious crops, potentially undermining achievement of goals related to improved diet quality. Review and monitor the potential impacts of price support for staple crops on the production of more nutrient-rich foods. Consider rebalancing price support. Price support for crops can also encourage overproduction, potentially undermining achievement of environmental sustainability goals. Review and monitor the potential environmental impacts of price support for staple crops. Consider reducing or eliminating price supports associated with negative environmental impacts. Minimum prices for staple crops can raise food prices for consumers and negatively impact food security. Review and monitor the potential impacts of price support for staple crops and food prices. Consider reducing or eliminating price supports associated with higher food prices.
	No	Neutral	0	R: Minimum guaranteed output prices can encourage increased production of these crops, thus increasing supply, though this comes with trade-offs noted above. Consider whether, in the context, these would be helpful on balance to enact.
7	Yes	Reinforcing	2	T: Output subsidies for staple crops can shift incentives towards producing them and away from producing more nutritious crops, potentially undermining achievement of 'Healthy Diets' as an outcome. Review and monitor the potential impacts of price support for staple crops on the production of more nutrient-rich foods. Consider rebalancing price support. Output subsidies can encourage overproduction, potentially undermining achievement of environmental sustainability goals. Possible mitigation: Review and monitor the potential environmental impacts of price support for staple crops. Consider reducing or eliminating subsidies associated with negative environmental impacts.
	No	Neutral	0	R: Output subsidies can encourage increased production of these crops, thus increasing supply, though this comes with trade-offs noted above. Consider whether, in the context, these would be helpful on balance to enact.

#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
8	Yes	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider removing output price ceilings to increase incentives for crop production. Consider alternative interventions to ensure affordability, such as social protection support for the most vulnerable consumers.
	No	Neutral	0	

Goal 1.2: Affordable Prices for Main Staple Crops

#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
1	Yes	Conflicting	-2	R: Price support for staple crops can encourage domestic production but can also raise prices for consumers and negatively impact food security. Output price support for staple crops can also shift incentives away from producing more nutritious crops, with potential negative impacts on nutrition, and could also encourage overproduction, undermining achievement of environmental sustainability goals. Consider other interventions to increase production, such as investments in productivity-enhancing technologies.
	No	Neutral	0	
2	Yes	Reinforcing	2	T: Output subsidies for staple crops can shift incentives towards producing them and away from producing more nutritious crops, potentially undermining achievement of goals related to improved diet quality. Review and monitor the potential impacts of price support for staple crops on the production of more nutrient-rich foods. Consider rebalancing price support. Output subsidies can also encourage overproduction, potentially undermining achievement of environmental sustainability goals. Review and monitor the potential environmental impacts of price support for staple crops. Consider reducing or eliminating price supports associated with negative environmental impacts.
	No	Neutral	0	R: Output subsidies for staple crops may reduce prices for consumers, increasing affordability, though this comes with trade-offs noted above. Consider whether, in the context, these would be helpful on balance to enact.
3	Yes	Reinforcing	2	T: While output price ceilings can lower consumer prices, they also reduce incentives for producers, potentially resulting lower production of the staple crop. They can also reduce producers' incomes and have negative implications for rural poverty and hunger. Review and monitor potential impacts of price ceilings on production of staple crops. Consider removing output price ceilings to increase incentives for crop production. Consider alternative interventions to ensure affordability, such as subsidies for purchasers.
	No	Neutral	0	R: Price ceilings for staple crops may reduce prices for consumers, increasing affordability, though this comes with trade-offs noted above. Consider whether, in the context, these would be helpful on balance to enact.
4	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider establishing national marketing platforms or commodity boards that help absorb surplus food on the farm spot and sell to the consumers at farmgate prices or lower affordable prices to reduce food insecurity.

#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
5	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider establishing or strengthening market information systems to increase transparency and make price information more widely available to value chain actors.
6	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider providing support for crop futures markets in order to help mitigate seasonal price variability.

Goal 2.1: Food Systems Better Adapted to Climate Change

#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
1	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider investing in R&D programmes focused on climate-adapted seeds to increase crop productivity under climate change.
2	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider investing in R&D programmes focused on climate-adapted livestock breeds to increase livestock productivity under climate change.
3	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider efforts to increase the adoption of climate-smart agriculture practices to maintain or increase productivity under climate change. Efforts to increase the adoption of climate-smart agriculture could include R&D programmes focused on developing or adapting climate-smart practices, extension and training programmes to disseminate climate-smart practices, and technical or financial assistance to farmers implementing climate-smart practices.
4	Yes	Reinforcing	2	T: Expansion of irrigation can result in excessive and unsustainable water use, causing negative impacts such as water scarcity, reduced water quality, and soil erosion. Irrigation expansion projects should include analyses of impacts on water use. Consider efforts to decrease excessive water use associated with irrigation, such as support for increasing irrigation efficiency, extension services to promote optimal application of irrigation water, etc. Consider complementary efforts to promote water conservation such as rainwater harvesting. Expansion of irrigation can also increase risks of vector-borne diseases. Irrigation expansion projects should include complementary efforts to mitigate risks of vector-borne disease, e.g. support for integrated pest and vector management.
	No	Neutral	0	

#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider providing support for the expansion, operation, or maintenance of irrigation to increase agricultural productivity under variable rainfall conditions. In addition to large-scale irrigation, consider the potential for small-scale irrigation technologies. Also be aware of potential negative impacts on the water footprint of the food system as well as potential risks of vector-borne diseases associated with irrigation expansion.
5	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider providing support for water conservation practices to increase the availability of water for agricultural production and improve productivity under variable rainfall conditions. Support can include R&D programmes focused on developing or adapting water conservation practices, extension and training programmes to disseminate water conservation practices, and technical or financial assistance to farmers implementing water conservation practices.
6	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider efforts to diversify crops to deal with risk and uncertainty related to climate change, and improve soil fertility as well as controlling pests and diseases. Since crop diversification can lower economic efficiency of some farms, and thus farmer incomes, consider such impacts when deciding how to best support crop diversification.
7	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider investing in the provision of weather index-based insurance to mitigate the impacts of climate shocks on farmers' livelihoods and assets.
8	Yes	Conflicting	-2	R: Support for staple crop production that is not available to producers of other crops may encourage monocropping and over-reliance on staple crop production, with the risk of decreasing the resilience of farming systems. Consider rebalancing support to avoid incentivising staple crop production over production of other crops.
	No	Neutral	0	

Goal 2.2: Climate Change Mitigation Through Food Systems

#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
1	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No (1)	Conflicting	-2	R: Subsidies linked to the level of output can contribute to agricultural GHG emissions by encouraging overproduction. Consider delinking producer subsidies from output level, or targeting subsidies to crops and livestock/fish associated with lower GHG emissions.
	No (2)	Neutral	0	

#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
2	Yes	Conflicting	-2	R: In some cases, fertiliser subsidies can contribute to GHG emissions by encouraging overapplication of fertiliser. Consider encouraging appropriate use, but not overuse, of fertiliser through other interventions, such as improving fertiliser efficiency through soil fertility mapping. Also consider promotion of integrated soil fertility management approaches that combine inorganic fertiliser with other practices to raise soil fertility.
	No	Neutral	0	
3	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider increasing support for integrated soil fertility management approaches, which can reduce GHG emissions from agriculture as well as increasing soil health and productivity.
4	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No (1)	Conflicting	-2	R: Agricultural mechanisation can be associated with greater GHG emissions. In order to lessen the climate impacts of increased agricultural mechanisation, consider increasing support for energy-efficient machinery, machinery using renewable energy, and other practices or actions to reduce emissions associated with mechanisation.
	No (2)	Neutral	0	
5	Yes (1)	Highly Conflicting	-3	R: To lessen the climate impacts of increased livestock numbers, consider removing such policies, particularly for ruminants, which tend to have the highest associated GHG emissions. Since less support for increased livestock numbers can result in lower availability and/or affordability of animal-source foods, which may be in conflict with the goal of improving diet quality in contexts where such foods are under-consumed, consider promoting production and consumption of animal-source foods associated with lower GHG emissions, such as through productivity enhancing measures.
	Yes (2)	Conflicting	-2	
	Yes (3)	Reinforcing	2	T: less support for increased livestock numbers can result in lower availability and/or affordability of animal-source foods, which may be in conflict with the goal of improving diet quality in contexts where such foods are under-consumed, consider promoting production and consumption of animal-source foods associated with lower GHG emissions, such as through productivity enhancing measures.
	No	Neutral	0	
6	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Conflicting	-2	R: To lessen the climate impacts of increased livestock production, consider increasing support for practices such manure management, feed additives, rotational grazing, and other interventions to reduce emissions from livestock.
7	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider putting greater emphasis on developing or adapting crop varieties that can contribute to climate change mitigation by producing lower GHG emissions or sequestering GHG.

#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
8	Yes	Conflicting	-2	R: Conversion of forested areas and other ecosystems such as grasslands and wetlands to cropland or grazing land is an important contributor to GHG emissions. Consider taking measures to reduce deforestation and other land conversion, such as incentives for forest conservation, restrictions on deforestation, or incentives to increase cropland and grazing land area by rehabilitating degraded land. Since limiting the land available for agricultural cropland and grazing land expansion could negatively affect agricultural production growth, invest in yield-enhancing technologies and practices (e.g. integrated soil fertility management, mechanisation, use of improved seeds, improved water management.).
	No (1)	Neutral	0	R: Consider strengthening policies by noting the importance of reducing agricultural production areas.
	No (2)	Reinforcing	2	

Goal 3.1: More Nutritious Food Consumption

#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
1	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No (1)	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider expanding the focus of R&D programmes to include more nutritious crops such as fruits, vegetables and legumes and/or livestock and fisheries products to avoid promotion of production of staple crops at the expense of more nutritious foods.
	No (2)	Neutral	0	
2	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider exploring the potential for biofortification to increase the intake of nutritious foods by enhancing the nutrient content of crops, given the local context (e.g., agricultural production systems and nutrient needs).
3	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No (1)	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider expanding the focus of extension services to include producers of more nutritious crops such as fruits, vegetables and legumes and/or livestock and fisheries products in order to avoid promotion of production of staple crops at the expense of more nutritious foods.
	No (2)	Neutral	0	
4	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No (1)	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider rebalancing the targeting of input subsidy programmes to include producers of more nutritious crops such as fruits, vegetables and legumes and/or livestock producers to avoid promoting production of staple crops at the expense of more nutritious foods.
	No (2)	Neutral	0	

#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
5	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider increasing support for the development, maintenance or upgrading of cold chain infrastructure to facilitate the distribution of nutritious perishable products such as fruits, vegetables, and certain animal products.
6	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider adding a focus on market development for nutritious crops and/or nutritious animal products to increase consumers' access to nutritious foods.
7	Yes (1)	Highly Reinforcing	3	T: Expansion of irrigation can result in excessive and unsustainable water use, causing negative impacts such as water scarcity, reduced water quality, and soil erosion. Irrigation expansion projects should include analyses of impacts on water use. Consider efforts to decrease excessive water use associated with irrigation, such as support for increasing irrigation efficiency, or extension services to promote optimal application of irrigation water. Consider complementary efforts to promote water conservation such as rainwater harvesting. Expansion of irrigation can also increase risks of vector-borne diseases. Irrigation expansion projects should include complementary efforts to mitigate risks of vector-borne disease, e.g. support for integrated pest and vector management.
	Yes (2)	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider options to ensure reliable water access for crop producers, particularly producers of nutritious crops, such as irrigation, water harvesting, or more efficient use of groundwater.
8	Yes	Reinforcing	2	T: Emissions related to animal-source production tend to be high relative to those from plant-based foods, contributing to climate change. Other types of environmental impacts may also be higher.
	No	Neutral	0	R: consider providing support for sustainable livestock and fisheries production, including veterinary extension services and inputs, farmer training on sustainable practices such as silvopasture systems, and use of crop by-products as feed.

Goal 3.2: Less Unhealthy Food Consumption

#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
1	Yes	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider rebalancing the targeting of output subsidy or price support programmes to include producers of more nutritious crops, such as fruits, vegetables and legumes and/or livestock producers, to avoid promotion of production of oilseeds or sugar at the expense of more nutritious foods. While oils and fats are a necessary part of a healthy diet, they are often overconsumed, which can be more likely when they are cheaper or more widely available.
	No	Neutral	0	

#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
2	Yes	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider rebalancing the targeting of input subsidy programmes to include producers of more nutritious crops such as fruits, vegetables and legumes and/or livestock producers to avoid promotion of production of oilseeds or sugar at the expense of more nutritious foods. While oils and fats are a necessary part of a healthy diet, they are often overconsumed, which can be more likely when they are cheaper or more widely available.
	No	Neutral	0	

Goal 4.1: Reduction of Food Loss and Waste

#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
1	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider providing support, for example through extension services or financial support, for farm management practices to reduce post-harvest losses such as handling and drying practices.
2	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider investing in the development and dissemination of storage technologies designed to reduce post-harvest losses, for example through funded programmes of national agricultural research services, partnerships with private sector providers, or provision of technologies and extension advice to farmers.
3	Yes	Conflicting	-2	R: Mandated crop harvest dates can result in crops being harvested at inappropriate times and thereby promote spoilage. Consider allowing farmers to choose harvest dates, potentially with advice from extension services or climate/weather data.
	No	Neutral	0	
4	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider including support for circular economy practices in agricultural policies and instruments. Support could include financial and human resource allocation to extension and training services and public information campaigns promoting use of food scraps as animal feed, food upcycling, as well as institutional arrangements for collecting and using food scraps from businesses.
5	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider increasing support for the development, maintenance or upgrading of cold chain infrastructure to reduce post-harvest losses of perishable foods.
6	Yes	Conflicting	-2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Producer subsidies linked with the level of output can encourage overproduction and lead to food loss and waste. Consider substituting forms of support that are not linked to production levels.

#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
7	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider establishing national marketing platforms or commodity boards that help absorb surplus food on the farm spot markets to curb potential food loss and waste.

Goal 5.1: Adequate / Living Wages for Food System Workers				
#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
1	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider establishing minimum wages for agricultural workers. Minimum wages should be set to ensure adequate incomes for daily needs. As minimum wages for agricultural workers could potentially contribute to higher food prices, monitor such impacts and consider expanding social protection programmes (such as vouchers for food purchases) to improve food access.
2	Yes	Reinforcing	2	R: Consider providing education and training programmes targeted to increase skills of agricultural workers, such as training on use of labour-saving technologies and practices.
	No	Neutral	0	
3	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider providing education and training programmes targeted to improving skills of workers in post-farm segments of agricultural value chains, such as training on use of labour-saving technologies and practices.
4	Yes	Reinforcing	2	T: Expansion of irrigation can have negative potential ramifications for the water footprint of the food system.
	No	Neutral	0	R: Irrigation can increase the productivity of agricultural labour and thus can promote increased wages and incomes. Consider providing support for the expansion, operation, or maintenance of irrigation to improve agricultural labour productivity. In addition to large-scale irrigation, consider the potential for small-scale irrigation technologies.
5	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No (1)	Conflicting	-2	R: Although expansion of agricultural mechanisation can increase labour productivity and thus promote increased wages and incomes, in some cases mechanisation may potentially lead to reduced employment opportunities for agricultural workers. Mechanisation policies should be informed by context-specific assessments of potential impacts on employment. Adverse labour impacts are less likely when mechanisation addresses existing labour shortages. Consider adding provisions to avoid labour displacement, such as training workers on the operation and maintenance of agricultural equipment to upskill them and increase employment opportunities.

#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
	No (2)	Neutral	0	R: Mechanisation can increase the productivity of agricultural labour and thus can promote increased wages and incomes. Consider providing support for the expansion of agricultural mechanisation, such as financial support for equipment rental services or provision of training on equipment operation, maintenance and repair, as a means of increasing agricultural labour productivity. To avoid adverse impacts, mechanisation policies should be informed by context-specific assessments of potential impacts on employment.
6	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Enact policies that support secure land tenures. Secure land tenure can encourage farmers to invest in long-term land improvements that could lead to higher agricultural productivity and potentially create more jobs in the sector. This can also be used as security to obtain credits, which can be used for productivity-enhancing investments.

Goal 5.2: More Effective Nutrition-Sensitive Social Protection

[No questions included for this Goal + Policy Area combination]

Goal 6.1: Empowerment of Women and Girls to Participate in Food System Transformation				
#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
1	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Unequal access to inputs among women farmers limits women's profits and incomes and reduces overall productivity. Consider policy action specifically targeted to improving women farmers' access to inputs.
2	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Unequal access to information such as weather forecasts and alerts and market and price information hinders women farmers' ability to make well-informed decisions. Services designed with a default 'male farmer' in mind might not consider ways in which women may have different needs. Consider policy action specifically targeted to improve women farmers' access to information services. This could include use of gender-sensitive language, consideration of alternative communication channels to better reach women.
3	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider policy action specifically targeted to improving women farmers' access to extension advice to address women's disproportionate challenges in benefitting from extension.

#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
4	Yes (1)	Highly Reinforcing	3	
	Yes (2)	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider policy action specifically targeted to improving women farmers' access to finance to address women's disproportionate challenges in accessing finance.
5	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider including efforts to develop technologies and practices that respond to women farmers' priorities and preferences into national agricultural R&D programmes. Design of technologies and practices should be informed by consultations with and feedback from women farmers and should address the gender norms that impact the social and cultural acceptability of different technologies and practices.

Health / Nutrition Policy and Instruments

Goal 1.1: Increased Supply of Main Staple Crops

#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
1	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider increasing support to access to health services for agricultural workers and/or in rural areas in order to increase agricultural labour productivity.
2	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider increasing support for access to improved sanitation and safe drinking water in rural areas in order to increase agricultural labour productivity through improved health.
3	Yes	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider whether efforts to promote non-staple crops could have a negative impact on staple crop production. Be aware of potential tradeoffs with nutrition goals, as promoting non-staple crops can have beneficial impacts on access to diverse and nutritious diets.
	No	Neutral	0	

Goal 1.2: Affordable Prices for Main Staple Crops

[No questions included for this Goal + Policy Area combination]

Goal 2.1: Food Systems Better Adapted to Climate Change

#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
1	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider explicitly recognising climate change as a threat in national health/nutrition policies to signal awareness of and commitment to addressing climate change-associated health risks.
2	Yes	Reinforcing	2	

#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider increasing support for control of vector-borne diseases, such as malaria, dengue, and tick-borne diseases, and/or actions to prevent or deal with heat-related illnesses.
3	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider increasing support for access to healthcare in natural disasters to protect food system actors from climate change impacts.

Goal 2.2: Climate Change Mitigation Through Food Systems

#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
1	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider ensuring that health/nutrition policies and instruments promote the use of NWFP for food to reduce pressure on land for agricultural food production.
2	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider ensuring that health/nutrition policies and instruments promote demand-side climate mitigation measures, such as dietary shifts, without compromising food and nutrition security. Examples include promoting consumption of low-emissions, plant-based sources of nutrients usually found in animal-source foods (e.g. legumes, nuts, plant-based dairy, insects, algae).

Goal 3.1: More Nutritious Food Consumption

#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
1	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider implementing nutrition information and education campaigns to inform consumers about the dangers of unhealthy foods and provide guidelines on achieving healthy diets.
2	Yes (1)	Highly Reinforcing	3	
	Yes (2)	Reinforcing	2	R: Consider making the required labels front-of-pack labels, which may be more likely to be noticed by consumers.

#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
	No	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider requiring mandatory nutrient lists on processed food products. Information labels should be clear, simple and understandable for consumers; consider including warning signs for unhealthy foods. Consider combining labelling requirements with information campaigns to educate consumers on how to read labels and use the information provided.
3	Yes (1)	Highly Reinforcing	3	
	Yes (2)	Reinforcing	2	R: Consider adding measures to support firms to adhere to requirements, such as training.
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider putting in place mandatory fortification requirements accompanied by measures to support firms to adhere to requirements, such as training.

Goal 3.2: Less Unhealthy Food Consumption				
#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
1	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider banning trans fats in foods, as these are widely recognized as harmful to human health, such as by increasing risk of cardiovascular disease.
2	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider instituting limits on salt, sugar, and/or fat content of processed foods to lessen risks of diet-related non-communicable diseases.
3	Yes (1)	Highly Reinforcing	3	
	Yes (2)	Reinforcing	2	R: Consider making the required labels front-of-pack labels, which may be more likely to be noticed by consumers.
	No	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider requiring mandatory nutrient lists on processed food products. Information labels should be clear, simple and understandable for consumers; consider including warning signs for unhealthy foods. Consider combining labelling requirements with information campaigns to educate consumers on how to read labels and use the information provided.
4	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider instituting mandatory regulation of food advertising, potentially including restrictions on advertising of food products high in fat, salt or sugar, particularly to children.
5	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider implementing nutrition information and education campaigns to inform consumers about the dangers of unhealthy foods and provide guidelines on achieving healthy diets.

#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
6	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Adopt guidelines for food available in schools to promote the consumption of healthy food in schools and limit consumption of unhealthy food.

Goal 4.1: Reduction of Food Loss (Post-Harvest, Pre-Consumer) and Food Waste (Consumer-Level)				
#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
1	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider including support for education and training for consumers to address improper storage of perishable food at the household level.
2	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider supporting training on good practices for food handling for supply-chain actors, to prevent contamination and thus waste.
3	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider instruments including consumer education campaigns (e.g. general public, schools, restaurants) on food waste and loss in health and/or nutrition policies and instruments.
4	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider updating Food-Based Dietary Guidelines to align with recommendations to tackle food loss and waste. Alignment could include the inclusion of guidelines on portion sizes, food storage, use of leftovers, and promotion of seasonal and local foods.

Goal 5.1: Adequate / Living Wages for Food System Workers				
#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
1	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider promoting guidelines for workplace nutrition interventions for food system workers including the use of healthy, well-balanced meals (e.g., low in salt, sugar, fat and highly processed foods, containing more legumes and whole grains as well as fruits and vegetables.)
2	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider promoting programmes that aim to change food system workers' dietary and/or lifestyle behaviours by increasing their nutritional knowledge and health literacy.
3	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider promoting health checks and counselling for food systems workers.
4	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider promoting food system workers' health insurance, such as through government or employer subsidies or universal healthcare.

Goal 5.2: More Effective Nutrition-Sensitive Social Protection				
#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
1	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider instituting micronutrient supplementation programmes for nutritionally vulnerable populations to help fill identified micronutrient deficiencies.

Goal 6.1: Empowerment of Women and Girls to Participate in Food System Transformation				
#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
1	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider targeting outreach and capacity strengthening on family nutrition and child health topics to men as well as women to promote more shared responsibilities between women and men and lessen women's workloads.
2	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider supporting the access of women of reproductive age to contraception and family planning counselling.
3	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider ensuring the provision of free or subsidised maternal and child healthcare.

Environmental Policy and Instruments

Goal 1.1: Increased Supply of Main Staple Crops				
#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
1	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider developing mechanisms to recognise and protect land tenure or land use rights to incentivise productivity-enhancing investments by producers.
2	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider explicit efforts to support women's and youth's access to land to ensure that insecure or unequal access does not constrain agricultural productivity.
3	Yes (1)	Reinforcing	2	
	Yes (2)	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider supporting more efficient use of agricultural chemicals (e.g., by disseminating precision agriculture technologies and practices) to limit the use of chemicals while maintaining or increasing agricultural productivity.
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider supporting more efficient use of agricultural chemicals (e.g., by disseminating precision agriculture technologies and practices) to increase agricultural productivity without increasing input use. Carefully consider whether to restrict use of these chemicals without providing support for more efficient use, or alternative approaches, as this could decrease staple crop production.
4	Yes (1)	Reinforcing	2	
	Yes (2)	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider efforts to support more efficient use of groundwater to limit its use while maintaining or increasing agricultural productivity.
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider efforts to promote more efficient use of groundwater to maintain or increase agricultural productivity without increasing groundwater use.
5	Yes	Neutral	0	
	No (1)	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider complementary actions to ensure that GHG reductions do not require decreases in agricultural production, e.g. through R&D, extension services, diffusion of technologies and practices, etc.
	No (2)	Neutral	0	
6	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider support for efforts to increase crop productivity by improving soil fertility, such as conservation agriculture practices. Consider investing in soil testing and soil mapping to better understand soil nutrient needs.

#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
7	Yes	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider modifying these limitations to ensure that they enable sufficient land available for staple crop production. This could include a focus on sustainable intensification on existing land by increasing productivity or some de-prioritisation of certain lower-environmental-value forests for conservation (while conserving those of the highest environmental value). Note there may be a trade-off with environmental goals of GHG sequestration and biodiversity conservation.
	No	Neutral	0	

Goal 1.2: Affordable Prices for Main Staple Crops

#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
1	Yes (1)	Reinforcing	2	
	Yes (2)	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider supporting more efficient use of agricultural chemicals (e.g., by disseminating precision agriculture technologies and practices) to limit the use of chemicals while maintaining or increasing agricultural productivity.
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider supporting more efficient use of agricultural chemicals (e.g., by disseminating precision agriculture technologies and practices) to increase agricultural productivity without increasing input use. Carefully consider whether to restrict use of these chemicals without providing support for more efficient use, or alternative approaches, as this could decrease staple crop production and increase prices.
2	Yes	Reinforcing	2	T: In some cases, use of improved crop varieties could result in temporarily higher food prices, although this is context dependent. However, in the long run, climate-resilient crops are expected to increase production and price stability and ultimately contribute to lower food prices.
	No	Neutral	0	R: Crop failure due to climate change (such as extreme heat) can lead to shortages and an increase in food prices. Consider efforts to increase the use of drought-tolerant or climate-resilient staple crops, for example through increased investment in agricultural R&D to develop or adapt new varieties or extension services to promote use of resistant varieties.
3	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider efforts to establish/improve food crisis prevention systems, such as early-warning systems, particularly including information on climate variability and change.
4	Yes	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider efforts to improve the yield of staple crop through delivering packaged extension services
	No	Neutral	0	T: Conversion of land to staple crop production can have a negative impact on conservation and biodiversity.
5	Yes	Conflicting	-2	R: Restricting water use for production could have negative implications for productivity of staple crops. Consider efficient water use approaches such as drip systems, sprinklers, soil sensors, and precision irrigation.
	No	Neutral	0	

#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
6	Yes	Conflicting	-2	R: Conversion of pasture or cropland to biofuel production can have negative impacts on the production and prices of crops and livestock. When considering biofuel production incentives, assess tradeoffs in terms of potential increased food prices. Consider production of biofuels from crop residues or non-edible portions of crops, allowing both food and fuel to be obtained from the same land.
	No	Neutral	0	
7	Yes	Conflicting	-2	R: Restrictions on the use of synthetic inputs could have negative implications for productivity and for prices of crops, including staple crops. As an alternative to direct restrictions, consider promoting better and more efficient use of agricultural inputs through improved extension services and other practices not entirely reliant on agricultural inputs for improved yield.
	No	Neutral	0	

Goal 2.1: Food Systems Better Adapted to Climate Change

#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
1	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider support for efforts to increase crop productivity by improving soil conservation, such as anti-erosion measures including contour farming and terracing, water run-off regulation, or integrated soil fertility techniques that include composting. These efforts should be combined with broader support for soil-friendly farming practices that preserve or increase overall soil health.
2	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider efforts to maintain or improve early warning systems to anticipate and manage natural disasters, pest outbreaks and yield failures, and enable local governments, communities, and farmers to prepare and take timely actions.
3	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider efforts to improve agricultural production by improving/enhancing land conservation and protection against erosion and floods in places locations that are vulnerable to climate change.
4	Yes	Reinforcing	2	T: Afforestation and related measures can create a trade-off with food security goals as they may minimise land for crop cultivation (though they may also enable production of nutritious foods in forests or mixed systems).
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider efforts to promote reforestation and improve forest quality for agroforestry purposes. Such interventions can result in increased soil conservation and crop and livelihood diversification. This intervention does not convert farmland to forest.

Goal 2.2: Climate Change Mitigation Through Food Systems				
#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
1	Yes	Reinforcing	2	T: Afforestation and related measures can create a trade-off with food security goals as they may minimise land for crop cultivation (though they may also enable production of nutritious foods in forests or mixed systems).
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider support for reforestation of degraded rural areas as well as in urban and peri-urban places. Tree planting can help to restore biodiversity in agricultural landscapes, while increasing soil fertility by enhancing the accumulation of organic matter from decaying nature.
2	Yes (1)	Highly Reinforcing	3	
	Yes (2)	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider efforts to improve water use efficiency by using drip irrigation systems, sprinkler irrigation systems, soil sensors, and similar. Improving water use efficiency in irrigation can lead to reduced energy consumption for irrigation, lowering carbon emissions. Also consider efforts to improve the use of renewable energy in pumping water for irrigation.
3	Yes	Reinforcing	2	T: Exclusion of grazing grasslands can reduce the land available for livestock grazing and minimise livestock production, resulting in lower availability of livestock products and/or higher prices, which may harm diet quality in contexts with low consumption of these products.
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider efforts to increase fodder productivity and increase the area of fodder crops in forested areas. Grassland related measures can help advance mitigation through soil carbon sequestration.
4	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider freshwater restoration measures such as restoring and safeguarding wetland ecosystems, safeguarding of lakes, river stabilisation techniques, etc. Protecting and restoring freshwater ecosystems can help reduce GHG emissions by improving natural capacity to absorb and store carbon.
5	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider efforts to improve renewable energy consumption, such as investing in R&D for cost-effective renewable energy technology, creating incentives for adoption, and educating consumers and businesses on such options.
6	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider efforts to expand the circular economy. This includes encouraging investment in circular agriculture, enhancing the capacity of agricultural producers in recycling and reusing by-products, awareness raising and capacity building, and establishing appropriate legal frameworks.

Goal 3.1: More Nutritious Food Consumption				
#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
1	Yes	Conflicting	-2	R: Land consolidation can lead to increased production of staple crops at the expense of more nutritious crops and can be associated with lower consumption of nutritious foods. If land consolidation is promoted, consider including provisions to ensure continued production of nutrient-rich crops and to monitor impacts on diets.
	No	Neutral	0	
2	Yes	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider updating land zoning to permit the use of land for urban and peri-urban agriculture, which can serve as an important source of nutritious foods.
	No	Neutral	0	
3	Yes	Reinforcing	2	T: if not practiced sustainably, agroforestry can degrade natural resources, harming climate change mitigation and adaptation as well as biodiversity conservation.
		Neutral	0	
	No	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider adapting policies to enable some sustainable use of forests for producing or harvesting food.
4	Yes	Conflicting	-2	R: Fishing restrictions are important to ensure long-term sustainability of fisheries. To minimise short-term impacts on nutritious food access, ensure that fishing restrictions are evidence-based. Consider promoting diverse seafood species to reduce pressures on at risk populations and/or efficient production of plant- or animal-based alternatives to fish.
	No	Neutral	0	
5	Yes	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider use of improved varieties of fruits and vegetables that consume little water. Assess options to increase the efficiency of water use in agriculture and other sectors.
	No	Neutral	0	

Goal 3.2: Less Unhealthy Food Consumption				
#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
1	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Plastics, particularly single-use plastics, both contribute to pollution and facilitate cheap production and sale of highly processed foods, which can be unhealthy. Plastics can also leach chemicals into foods, making them less healthy. Consider enacting legislation to reduce the use of plastic food packaging, particularly single-use packaging.

Goal 4.1: Reduction of Food Loss (Post-Harvest, Pre-Consumer) and Food Waste (Consumer-Level)				
#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
1	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider support to convert food waste to renewable energy by raising awareness and providing incentives or technical support.
2	Yes	Reinforcing	2	T: Methane emissions occur during composting; if not properly managed, these can contribute to climate change. This can be mitigated with training on correct composting, including pre-sorting of food waste and proper aeration.
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider support for composting food waste through awareness creation, training, technical support, incentive provision, and similar.
3	Yes (1)	Reinforcing	2	
	Yes (2)	Conflicting	-2	R: Putting in place restrictions without support for more efficient use (or alternative approaches) could result in damaged or low-quality crops that are not suited for sale, leading to waste. Ensure restrictions are paired with farmer training, resource provision, or incentives to prevent this.
	No	Neutral	0	R: Overuse of pesticides and fertiliser can damage crops, which could result in losses. Underuse of pesticides without appropriate alternative practices, however, can also result in damage and thus loss, so balance is the key. Consider placing limits on excessive use pesticide or fertiliser with enforcement procedures accompanied by training and resources to support appropriate use.

Goal 5.1: Adequate / Living Wages for Food System Workers				
#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
1	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider support for green jobs that can help preserve or restore the environmental quality of the food system while providing living wages for food system workers. Support for green jobs can include investments in green industries, provision of skills development and training programmes, or funding R&D in green technologies.

Goal 5.2: More Effective Nutrition-Sensitive Social Protection				
#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
1	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider support for insurance mechanisms that promote nutrition-sensitive social protection by protecting households' assets and boosting their ability to maintain adequate food consumption following shocks, such as livestock insurance or index-based weather insurance.

Goal 6.1: Empowerment of Women and Girls to Participate in Food System Transformation				
#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
1	Yes (1)	Highly Reinforcing	3	
	Yes (2)	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Considering revision policies/instruments to acknowledge that women are differentially affected by climate change. Promote explicit gender-responsive adaptation interventions to climate change, including by increasing women's access to agricultural services (such as extension and credit).
2	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Conflicting	-2	R: To promote women's inclusion in food systems transformation, ensure their rights to access, use, control, inherit and own land are recognised and protected by law.

Trade Policy and Instruments

Goal 1.1: Increased Supply of Main Staple Crops				
#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
1	Yes (1)	Highly Conflicting	-3	R: Consider lowering tariffs on the main staple crop to make them more affordable and thus improve access, helping reduce hunger.
	Yes (2)	Conflicting	-2	
	Yes (3)	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Highly Reinforcing	3	
2	Yes (1)	Highly Conflicting	-3	R: Consider lowering tariffs on inputs for the main staple crops to make them more affordable and thus increase farmers' use of them, with less significant effects on output prices; these cheaper food prices may improve access, helping reduce hunger.
	Yes (2)	Conflicting	-2	
	Yes (3)	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Highly Reinforcing	3	
3	Yes	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider easing import restrictions on agricultural inputs to lower production costs, to strengthen food security, particularly food affordability.
	No	Neutral	0	
4	Yes (1)	Highly Conflicting	-3	R: Consider lowering tariffs on agricultural and food processing equipment and machinery to reduce agricultural production and investment costs, thereby improving affordability of agri-food products, including main staples.
	Yes (2)	Conflicting	-2	
	Yes (3)	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Highly Reinforcing	3	
5	Yes	Conflicting	-2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider easing import restrictions to increase agricultural supply and productivity, which can ultimately help drive down food prices.
6	Yes (1)	Reinforcing	2	T: Export restrictions can increase domestic supply but can decrease government revenue and producers' incomes. If these temporary measures are recurring regularly or long lasting, they can create a disincentive for farmers to invest in agriculture, thereby leading to scarcity and higher prices in the longer term. Tradeoffs related to export restrictions of staple crops should be considered carefully.

#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
	Yes (2)	Conflicting	-2	R: Export restrictions may be reinforcing for the goal of sufficient staple foods in the short term, such as during an acute food security crisis. However, they also come with important trade-offs, detailed above.
	No	Neutral	0	

Goal 1.2: Affordable Prices for Main Staple Crops

#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
1	Yes (1)	Highly Conflicting	-3	R: Consider lowering tariffs on the main staple crop to make them more affordable and thus improve access, helping reduce hunger.
	Yes (2)	Conflicting	-2	
	Yes (3)	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Highly Reinforcing	3	
2	Yes	Conflicting	-2	R: Disadvantaging imports of the main staple crops may lead to higher domestic prices for them. Consider aligning trade policies to rule-based ones that are obliged by the WTO.
	No	Neutral	0	
3	Yes	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider eliminating restrictive measures on the import of main staple crop to improve their affordability for domestic consumers. In the case of anti-dumping and countervailing duties, which are levied as legitimate trade defence measures, consider following the rules and discipline set forth in the WTO General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (GATT) to avoid unnecessary barriers to trade.
	No	Neutral	0	
4	Yes (1)	Highly Conflicting	-3	R: Consider lowering tariffs on the main staple crop to make them more affordable and thus improve access, helping reduce hunger.
	Yes (2)	Conflicting	-2	
	Yes (3)	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Highly Reinforcing	3	
5	Yes	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider easing import restrictions on agricultural inputs to lower production costs, to strengthen food security, particularly food affordability.
	No	Neutral	0	

#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
6	Yes (1)	Highly Conflicting	-3	R: Consider lowering tariffs on agricultural and food processing equipment and machinery to reduce agricultural production and investment costs, thereby improving affordability of agri-food products, including main staples.
	Yes (2)	Conflicting	-2	
	Yes (3)	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Highly Reinforcing	3	
7	Yes	Conflicting	-2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider easing import restrictions to increase agricultural supply and productivity, which can ultimately help drive down food prices.
8	Yes (1)	Reinforcing	2	T: Export restrictions can increase domestic supply but can decrease government revenue and producers' incomes. If these temporary measures are recurring regularly or long lasting, they can create a disincentive for farmers to invest in agriculture, thereby leading to scarcity and higher prices in the longer term. Tradeoffs related to export restrictions of staple crops should be considered carefully.
	Yes (2)	Conflicting	-2	R: Export restrictions may be reinforcing for the goal of affordable staple food prices in the short term, such as during an acute food security crisis. However, they also come with important trade-offs, detailed above.
	No	Neutral	0	

Goal 2.1: Food Systems Better Adapted to Climate Change				
#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
1	Yes (1)	Highly Reinforcing	3	
	Yes (2)	Reinforcing	2	R: It is possible for food system-related products to be overlooked when such clauses are applied. Consider specifying that these restrictions are relevant to the food system, with context-specific examples.
	No (1&2)	Neutral	0	R: Consider a comprehensive trade policy that obliges a sustainable food system and practices within the domestic economy, including prohibition of trade in environmentally dangerous commodities.
2	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider aligning with development and trade cooperation that prioritise sustainable development and allows members to access technical assistance to promote adaptation to climate change.

Goal 2.2: Climate Change Mitigation Through Food Systems				
#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
1	Yes (1)	Highly Reinforcing	3	
	Yes (2)	Reinforcing	2	R: It is possible for food system-related products to be overlooked in applying such policies. Consider specifying how these clauses are relevant to the food system, with context-specific examples.
	No (1&2)	Neutral	0	R: Consider renegotiation of existing trade agreements to include clauses obliging the trading partners to undertake climate change mitigation with particular focus on agri-food systems, given their role as a major source of GHG emissions.
2	Yes (1)	Highly Reinforcing	3	
	Yes (2)	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider levying taxes on exported products obtained via activities such as deforestation or other climate-degrading activities to reduce their potential impacts on climate change, ensuring that these cover food system products (e.g., crops grown on newly deforested land).
3	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider extending export subsidies to climate-smart exporters, in order to support them to adopt climate change-mitigating practices. Subsidies should follow WTO rules and guidelines so that they do not create unnecessary trade issues.

Goal 3.1: More Nutritious Food Consumption				
#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
1	No	Reinforcing	2	T: Facilitating imports of nutritious foods carries a risk of undermining local production capacity. Consider combining low tariffs with complementary support for local production capacities, depending on national priorities and comparative advantage
	Yes (1)	Neutral	0	
	Yes (2)	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider reducing barriers to import of highly nutritious foods to lower their prices and/or increase their availability, thereby encouraging consumption to improve diet quality.
	Yes (3)	Highly Conflicting	-3	
2	No	Reinforcing	2	
	Yes (1)	Neutral	0	

#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
	Yes (2)	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider reducing barriers to import of inputs of highly nutritious foods to lower their prices and/or increase their availability, thereby encouraging consumption to improve diet quality.
	Yes (3)	Highly Conflicting	-3	
3	No	Reinforcing	2	
	Yes (1)	Neutral	0	
	Yes (2)	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider reducing barriers to import of fortification equipment in order to encourage fortification of staple foods with added nutrients and to make these fortified foods cheaper, thereby encouraging consumption to improve diet quality.
	Yes (3)	Highly Conflicting	-3	
4	Yes	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider reducing or removing non-tariff barriers to the import of fortification equipment and inputs.
	No	Neutral	0	
5	Yes (1)	Reinforcing	2	
	Yes (2)	Neutral	0	
	No	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider supporting fast track import clearance in particular for perishable products including fruits and vegetables.

Goal 3.2: Less Unhealthy Food Consumption

#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
1	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Enact and implement SPS and TBT measures on labelling requirements to increase consumers' awareness about the composition of their food products to discourage the consumption of unhealthy food products.
2	Yes (1)	Highly Reinforcing	3	R: Consider lowering tariffs on the main staple crop to make them more affordable and thus improve access, helping reduce hunger.
	Yes (2)	Reinforcing	2	

#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
	Yes (3)	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider levying high tariffs that are compatible with WTO rules (non-discriminatory and not above the country's committed bound level) on less unhealthy foods to reduce their availability or affordability, thereby discouraging their domestic consumption. Note that limiting the affordability of potentially unhealthy foods could have consequences for the affordability of diets in general and risks negatively impacting consumers' purchasing power. The impacts of such policies on purchasing behaviour and diets should be monitored carefully.
	No	Highly Conflicting	-3	

Goal 4.1: Reduction of Food Loss and Waste				
#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
1	Yes	Reinforcing	2	R: Enact and implement SPS and TBT measures that enhance the quality and standards of food exports and imports to minimise risk of damage to the quality and quantity of food along the international food chain. Align current SPS and TBT measures to international measures such as those recommended by the WHO and FAO through the Codex Alimentarius Commission.
	No	Neutral	0	
2	Yes	Reinforcing	2	R: Optimise supply chain and port efficiency through improved port procedures and automation processes to ensure efficient and smart value chains. Sign and ratify bilateral/plurilateral trade facilitation agreement with trade partners to improve bilateral supply chain movement.
	No	Conflicting	-2	
3	A	Highly Reinforcing	3	R: Streamline border procedures, for example by enabling pre-arrival clearance for transit food products, establishing electronic single-window systems, establishing automated custom systems, and/or enabling special treatment for food products (particularly perishable products), among other actions. Set up SPS and TBT testing facilities at the port to avoid rejection and loss of products at the importing country's border to facilitate the movement of agricultural trade commodities..
	B	Reinforcing	2	
	C	Conflicting	-2	
	D	Highly Conflicting	-3	
4	Yes	Reinforcing	2	R: Consider ratifying the WTO trade facilitating agreements to expedite the movement and clearance of goods along the supply chain.
	No	Conflicting	-2	

Goal 5.1: Adequate / Living Wages for Food System Workers				
#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
1	Yes	Reinforcing	2	T: Trade agreements can help make wages more similar across countries. This means that in some countries (typically those with a lot of investment capital), wages might drop, while in countries with plenty of lower-cost workers, wages could rise. When trade agreements are designed to favour workers, they may encourage people to move to countries with such policies, which could lead to similar changes in wage levels, thus reducing incomes for some workers (while raising them for others)
	No (1)	Neutral	0	R: Consider including the protection of workers' rights (covering decent working conditions including adequate living wages for all workers including those in the food system) in the negotiation of future bilateral/plurilateral trade agreements.
	No (2)	Neutral	0	
2	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider ratifying labour-inclusive trade agreements, as they can help strengthen political commitment to enforcing decent living wages for domestic workers—including those in the food system—both in legislation and in practice.
3	Yes (1)	Highly Reinforcing	3	
	Yes (2)	Reinforcing	2	
	Yes (3)	Neutral	0	R: Consider renegotiating agreements to include mention of workers' rights and oblige a decent wage for workers in ratifying countries.
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider incorporating labour rights that align with ILO's decent work and conventions in future trade agreements to ensure that the protection of workers' rights including decent living wage is guaranteed.

Goal 5.1: Adequate / Living Wages for Food System Workers				
#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
1	Yes	Reinforcing	2	T: Trade agreements can help make wages more similar across countries. This means that in some countries (typically those with a lot of investment capital), wages might drop, while in countries with plenty of lower-cost workers, wages could rise. When trade agreements are designed to favour workers, they may encourage people to move to countries with such policies, which could lead to similar changes in wage levels, thus reducing incomes for some workers (while raising them for others)
	No (1)	Neutral	0	R: Consider including the protection of workers' rights (covering decent working conditions including adequate living wages for all workers including those in the food system) in the negotiation of future bilateral/plurilateral trade agreements.
	No (2)	Neutral	0	

#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
2	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider ratifying labour-inclusive trade agreements, as they can help strengthen political commitment to enforcing decent living wages for domestic workers—including those in the food system—both in legislation and in practice.
3	Yes (1)	Highly Reinforcing	3	
	Yes (2)	Reinforcing	2	
	Yes (3)	Neutral	0	R: Consider renegotiating agreements to include mention of workers' rights and oblige a decent wage for workers in ratifying countries.
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider incorporating labour rights that align with ILO's decent work and conventions in future trade agreements to ensure that the protection of workers' rights including decent living wage is guaranteed.

Goal 5.2: More Effective Nutrition-Sensitive Social Protection

#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
1	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No (1)	Neutral	0	
	No (2)	Conflicting	-2	
	No (3)	Highly Conflicting	-3	R: Consider exploring and using aid for trade initiatives and trade-related food assistance as a nutrition-related social security initiative that complements domestic efforts in facilitating the accessibility of the vulnerable and the population at large to nutritious food.

Goal 6.1: Empowerment of Women and Girls to Participate in Food System Transformation

#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
1	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No (1)	Neutral	0	R: Consider joining or ratifying agreements with clauses obliging the protection of women's rights (e.g., decent work, equal remuneration, eliminating employment discrimination) in all sectors, including the food system. Include the topic in future trade agreement negotiations.

#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
	No (2)	Neutral	0	
2	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No (1)	Neutral	0	
	No (2)	Neutral	0	R: Consider incorporating policies protecting women's rights and empowering women working in export processing zones in the country's export processing act as well as its national trade policy strategy in general.
3	Yes (1)	Highly Reinforcing	3	
	Yes (2)	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider working to improve women's engagement and inclusion in trade facilitation, as this may result in more equitable involvement of women in trade, including of food. The DSTF Surveys and accompanying reports can provide specific recommendations for how to do this.

Social Affairs Policy and Instruments (Social Protection, Labor, Women's Empowerment, Etc.)

Goal 1.1: Increased Supply of Main Staple Crops				
#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
1	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider extending coverage of social protection programmes to agricultural households and/or rural areas to help ensure that shocks do not negatively impact agricultural labour productivity.
2	Yes	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider coordinating public works programme schedules with agricultural calendar to ensure that public works do not compete for labour with agricultural activities.
	No (1)	Reinforcing	2	
	No (2)	Neutral	0	R: Depending on context, consider including public works programmes focused on restoring degraded land as a social protection option. Design of such programmes should ensure that public works do not compete with agricultural labour demand during key seasonal agricultural operations.
3	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No (1)	Neutral	0	R: Consider making provisions for local procurement of products, including staple crops, in programmes involving in-kind transfers of food. This can help to support the domestic production sector, improving staple crop availability.
	No (2)	Neutral	0	
4	Yes (1)	Highly Reinforcing	3	
	Yes (2)	Reinforcing	2	R: Consider increasing this recognition of the right to food to be explicit.
	No	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider legally recognising the right to food.

Goal 1.2: Affordable Prices for Main Staple Crops				
#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
1	Yes (1)	Highly Reinforcing	3	
	Yes (2)	Reinforcing	2	
	No (1)	Neutral	0	R: Consider expanding access to school meals to cover most or all students.

#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
	No (2)	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider creating a school meals programme or expanding access to a broader set of students: school meals can play a key role in addressing food insecurity by reducing the burden on families to provide food for their children and can also support educational attainment.
2	Yes (1)	Highly Reinforcing	3	T: Cash transfers for vulnerable households to access main staple crops can contribute to food price inflation if local markets are integrated enough to respond to increased purchasing power. Price dynamics should be monitored carefully to understand and, if needed, mitigate such effects.
	Yes (2)	Reinforcing	2	R: Consider expanding food aid / cash transfers to reach a larger share of vulnerable households.
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider including cash transfers for vulnerable households to access main staple crops when prices are low and availability stable, and consider direct food transfers when prices are high and/or availability is instable.
3	Yes (1)	Highly Reinforcing	3	T: Consumer price subsidies can have market-distorting effects, potentially leading to overproduction and waste. Subsidies on staple foods can increase diet shares of the staple food and decrease shares of non-staples, potentially decreasing consumption of more nutritious foods.
	Yes (2)	Reinforcing	2	T: R: Consider expanding subsidies to reach a larger share of vulnerable households
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider ensuring that social protection policies and instruments promote consumer price subsidies including vouchers and discounts for main staple crops to increase food access for vulnerable households. Consider accompanying these by incentives to increase consumption of non-staple foods, as well.
4	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider establishing and supporting national grain reserves as a food security mechanism used to stabilise main staple crop supplies and prices across seasons and in bad years.

Goal 2.1: Food Systems Better Adapted to Climate Change

#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
1	Yes (1)	Highly Reinforcing	3	
	Yes	Reinforcing	2	R: Considering expanding eligibility to cover all vulnerable populations.
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider the provision of cash or in-kind assistance to vulnerable populations in the face of natural disasters. In-kind assistance can include shelter, clothing, food and water, or medical supplies.
2	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider including support to prevent credit default on the part of small and medium-scale farmers and herders affected by extreme natural events.

#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
3	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider supporting food system actors in building resilience such as promotion of coping strategies based on productive assets (such as farming land or livestock).

Goal 2.2: Climate Change Mitigation Through Food Systems				
#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
1	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider ensuring that social protection policies are promoting public works contributing to carbon capture such as reforestation and restoration of ecosystems.
2	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider ensuring that labour policies are supporting green transition through sustained investments in food system workers' skills to apply sustainable practices in their current occupations, and to re-skill workers to facilitate the transition to new green jobs.
3	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No (1)	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider ensuring that the technologies that are promoted to reduce women's labour burden and boost incomes are climate mitigation technologies.
	No (2)	Neutral	0	R: Consider support for access to climate mitigating technologies that can reduce women's labour burden and boost incomes across the food value chain. This can include technologies such as solar-powered drip irrigation and solar dryers; processing technologies aiming to decrease emissions; or increased access to digital communications technologies.
4	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider establishing requirements for food aid distributions to source and supply exclusively sustainably produced, local, and/or climate-smart food commodities.

Goal 3.1: More Nutritious Food Consumption				
#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
1	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: consider including regulation that makes mandatory nutritious food supply in social protection programmes that involve public food procurement.
2	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider including requirements for supplying fortified micronutrient or bio-fortified products for in-kind transfers of staple food.
	None	Neutral	0	
3	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider ensuring that social protection policies and instruments support the mainstreaming of behaviour change communication of other nutrition information and education campaigns in social protection programmes.
4	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider including regulation on the provision of nutritious food in workplace canteen meals, potentially through occupational safety and health.

Goal 3.2: Less Unhealthy Food Consumption				
#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
1	No	Neutral	0	
	Yes (1)	Reinforcing	2	
	Yes (2)	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider implementing dietary guidelines for transferred food and/or including conditionalities with vouchers to ensure that less unhealthy food is transferred to or purchased by beneficiaries.
2	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider ensuring that social protection policies and instruments include education on the risk of unhealthy food consumption to ensure that mothers and families participating in social protection programmes are empowered to provide the best possible food and care for their children.
3	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider ensuring labour policy and instruments establish and enforce minimum wages that can facilitate access to ample and adequate foods to reduce reliance on cheaper food, which in some cases can be unhealthy.

Goal 4.1: Reduction of Food Loss (Post-Harvest, Pre-Consumer) and Food Waste (Consumer-Level)				
#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
1	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No (1)	Neutral	0	R: Consider including measures directed towards minimising and avoiding food wastage and loss in stockpiles. Measures could include improved storage facilities, proper logistics and distribution, inventory management, etc.
	No (2)	Neutral	0	
2	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider promoting the adoption of technologies that reduce food loss and waste such as using solar drying techniques and pickling to use up surplus food.
3	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider including Farm to School programme helping schools incorporate local, in season foods into meal programmes, which can help absorb surplus production and avoid waste.

Goal 5.1: Adequate / Living Wages for Food System Workers				
#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
1	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider progressively building and maintaining nationally appropriate social protection systems, so that everyone, including food system workers, has access to comprehensive, adequate and sustainable protection throughout their lifecycle.
2	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider encouraging compliance with and strengthening enforcement of employment legislation throughout the food system, including by facilitating inspections on farms, fisheries, ranches, processing plants, and other food value chain enterprises.
3	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider ensuring that workers, including those in the food system, are entitled to reasonable and fair compensation in the event of occupational injury or disease and to survivors' and dependents' benefits.
4	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider ensuring non-discrimination in the provision of social protection, including in terms of gender equality and the rights of often disadvantaged groups of workers, such as temporary, casual, and seasonal workers, or migrant workers.

Goal 5.2: More Effective Nutrition-Sensitive Social Protection				
#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
1	Yes	Highly Reinforcing	3	
	Partial	Reinforcing	2	R: Consider extending the existing policy / instruments to include mention of specific nutritionally vulnerable groups.
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider incorporating an explicit objective of improving nutrition of nutritionally vulnerable groups in social protection policies.
2	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider broadening the coverage of nutrition-focused social protection programmes to cover all individuals in nutritionally vulnerable groups (e.g. children under two, school-aged children, adolescents, pregnant or lactating women, the elderly).
3	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Increased women's empowerment and other gender-transformative outcomes can increase the effectiveness of social protection programmes, particularly as it relates to nutrition outcomes. Consider incorporating greater focus on gender-related issues in social protection programme design.

Goal 6.1: Empowerment of Women and Girls to Participate in Food System Transformation				
#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
1	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider ensuring that social affairs and policy instruments address gender gaps in rural development including in access to farm inputs, agricultural extension and technologies, as well as participation in farmers' organisations.
2	Yes	Highly Reinforcing	3	
	Partial (1)	Reinforcing	2	R: Consider developing a national gender strategy and integrating food systems topics within it.
	Partial (2)	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Considering mainstreaming gender equity into national policies while developing a national gender equity strategy or comprehensive guidelines to address gender equity challenges, narrow gender gaps and /or empower women and girls as well as men and boys. Consider specifically integrating food systems topics within these instruments.
3	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Conflicting	-2	R: Reducing gender-based violence (GBV) is a prerequisite for achieving other women's empowerment goals. GBV, including physical, sexual, and domestic violence, should be made illegal and punishable both in the public and private spheres. Complementary actions to combat GBV can include raising awareness of GBV, strengthening enforcement mechanisms, and providing legal assistance for victims.

#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
4	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider enacting policies and instruments to reduce women's segregation into low-skilled, low-paid, informal and casual jobs, including within agribusiness. Increasing women's employment and earnings facilitates inclusion in food systems transformation and contributes to empowerment.
5	Yes	Highly Reinforcing	3	
	Partial	Reinforcing	2	R: Consider including specific provisions to support both boys' and girls' participation and achievement. Be sure these apply to food systems-related education/training (e.g., agripreneurship programmes), as well.
	No	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider explicitly recognising the importance of equitable educational participation and outcomes, and including provisions to support girls' participation and achievements. Such provisions could include development of gender-sensitive curricula and teacher training programmes, community and family outreach, provision of sanitary facilities in schools, policies addressing gender-based discrimination in schools, M&E plans to track progress in improving equity, etc. Be sure these apply to food systems-related education/training, as well.
6	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider ensuring that education policy and instruments are promoting training for women and girls in agriculture and/or food and agriculture businesses to increase their access to better jobs in food systems.
7	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider increasing access to free or subsidised childcare and/or preschool to facilitate women's participation in entrepreneurship or employment, including within the food system.

Industrial, Economic Growth, and Monetary Policies and instruments

Goal 1.1: Increased Supply of Main Staple Crops				
#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
1	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Conflicting	-2	R: When revising national growth strategies, assess the role of agriculture in economic growth and consider recognising agriculture as a key sector for growth.
2	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider greater support for and investment in rural and last-mile infrastructure to improve producers' access to inputs and to markets.
3	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No (1)	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider extending support to staple crop processing firms and/or other firms in staple crop value chains segments, or prioritising forms of support that benefit all firms regardless of sector by improving the business environment (e.g. investments in infrastructure, energy, improved regulatory environment, skills development and training.)
	No (2)	Neutral	0	
4	Yes	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider reversing policies that limit the availability of foreign exchange for staple crop imports as they can reduce access to staple foods.
	No (1)	Neutral	0	
	No (2)	Reinforcing	2	
5	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No (1)	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider extending financial incentives to all producers to level the playing field for staple crop production.
	No (2)	Neutral	0	

Goal 1.2: Affordable Prices for Main Staple Crops				
#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
1	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Conflicting	-2	R: When revising national growth strategies, assess the role of agriculture in economic growth and consider recognising agriculture as a key sector for growth.
2	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider greater support for and investment in rural and last-mile infrastructure to improve producers' access to inputs and to markets.
3	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No (1)	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider extending support to staple crop processing firms and/or other firms in staple crop value chains segments, or prioritising forms of support that benefit all firms regardless of sector by improving the business environment (e.g. investments in infrastructure, energy, improved regulatory environment, skills development and training.)
	No (2)	Neutral	0	
4	Yes	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider reversing policies that limit the availability of foreign exchange for staple crop imports as they can reduce access to and increase prices for staple foods.
	No (1)	Neutral	0	
	No (2)	Reinforcing	2	
5	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No (1)	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider extending financial incentives to all producers to level the playing field for staple crop production.
	No (2)	Neutral	0	
6	Yes (1)	Reinforcing	2	
	Yes (2)	Conflicting	-2	R: Extend market regulations related to excessive pricing associated with anticompetitive behaviour to cover agri-food products, including staples.
	No	Neutral	0	

Goal 2.1: Food Systems Better Adapted to Climate Change				
#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
1	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: When revising national growth strategies, consider prioritising climate change adaptation in the agricultural sector and leveraging it to achieve green growth.
2	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider extending support or climate actions to agri-food firms, or prioritising climate actions that enable agri-food firms to better adapt to climate change issues. Examples of support could include tax rebates or holidays, subsidies, training and business development services, and other adaptation mechanisms that support green structural transition for agri-food firms.
3	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider extending climate-related financial incentives to all agri-food operators to enable holistic adaptation of the food sector to climate change.

Goal 2.2: Climate Change Mitigation Through Food Systems				
#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
1	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: When revising national growth strategies, consider prioritising climate change mitigation measures and embed such priorities and leveraging them to achieve green growth.
2	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider extending support or climate actions to agri-food firms, to enable agri-food firms to better contribute to climate change mitigation. This could include tax rebates or holidays, credits or financial incentives (e.g., green finance, discounted interest rates), subsidies to incentivise firms to reduce emissions, or climate-related training and business development services. It could also include financial measures like green finance, climate mitigation capital and reserve requirements, green refinancing operations, discounted interest rates, or green bonds.
3	Yes	Highly Reinforcing	3	
	Partial	Reinforcing	2	R: Consider including investment provisions for climate change mitigation in the food sector.
	No	Neutral	0	R: Link investment to national climate strategies and channel both domestic and international investment to climate change actions and practices.

#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
4	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider levying taxes or extending the tax base of the country on environmentally degrading products or activities or sectors, both food and non-food sectors. Also, set emission trading standards for each sector of the economy, including the agricultural and food sector, to reduce GHG emissions and use part of the revenue from the trading system to equip the food system to better mitigate the negative consequences of climate change impacts.

Goal 3.1: More Nutritious Food Consumption				
#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
1	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider greater support for and investment in rural and last-mile infrastructure to improve access to inputs and to markets by producers of nutritious foods. These can be particularly important for highly nutritious foods, as many of them tend to be highly perishable / damageable, and thus are more harmed by poor road quality, storage issues, delays, and similar.
2	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No (1)	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider extending support to firms processing nutritious foods and/or in other value chains segments, or prioritising forms of support that benefit all firms regardless of sector by improving the business environment (e.g. investments in infrastructure, energy, improved regulatory environment, skills development and training.)
	No (2)	Neutral	0	
3	Yes	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider reversing policies that limit the availability of foreign exchange for imports, as these can make imports of nutritious foods more difficult, resulting in lower availability or higher prices.
	No (1)	Neutral	0	
	No (2)	Reinforcing	2	
4	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No (1)	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider extending financial incentives to all producers to level the playing field for nutritious food production.
	No (2)	Neutral	0	
5	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider using policy instruments such as reductions or removal of value-added taxes to support access to affordable nutritious foods.

Goal 3.2: Less Unhealthy Food Consumption				
#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
1	Yes	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider barring firms producing unhealthy food from being eligible for production subsidies. Consider instead subsidising the production of healthy food through targeted subsidies targeted to healthy food producers. Mandate such firms to pass a certain percentage of the subsidy to consumers.
	No (1)	Reinforcing	2	
	No (2)	Neutral	0	
2	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider revising economic policies to make healthy food relatively more affordable, which may make unhealthy foods less desirable by comparison. This can be through approaches such as subsidies/discounts for healthy foods.
3	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: To disincentivise the consumption of unhealthy foods, consider implementing health-related food taxes, for example consumer taxes on the purchase of sugar-sweetened beverages or other foods deemed to pose public health risks. Since limiting the affordability of potentially unhealthy foods could have consequences for the affordability of diets in general and risks negatively impacting consumers' purchasing power, impacts of such policies on purchasing behaviour and diets should be monitored carefully and policies should be adjusted if necessary.

Goal 4.1: Reduction of Food Loss (Post-Harvest, Pre-Consumer) and Food Waste (Consumer-Level)				
#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
1	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Create incentives for companies to invest in or implement technologies that can help curb food loss and waste; these could include tax holidays, reduced tax coverage, low or interest-free loans.
2	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Enact and implement food loss and waste reduction provisions and targets as part of broader national economic strategic plans or policies.
3	No	Neutral	0	R: Invest in the necessary rural and last-mile infrastructure or/and provide incentives for the private sector to invest in such infrastructure. This can help make supply chains more efficient, reducing food loss and waste. Enable private-public participation in the provision of such infrastructure to increase market efficiency and ensure complementarity in the case of either market or government resourcing gaps.
	Yes	Reinforcing	2	

Goal 5.1: Adequate / Living Wages for Food System Workers				
#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
1	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Conflicting	-2	R: Negotiate minimum wage rates to ensure that workers have access to decent living wages aligned with current country realities (e.g., adjusting in the case of high inflation rates). Enable the freedom of workers' associations and trade unions to advocate for workers' adequate compensation.
2	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Conflicting	-2	R: Ensure that there is a minimum wage policy that ensures a decent living wage for all workers including those in the food sector, who may be particularly susceptible to precarious working conditions.
	Yes (1)	Highly Reinforcing	3	
	Yes (2)	Reinforcing	2	R: Consider making the policy more generous.
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider making provision of sick leave / medical leave mandatory for employees, including those in the food system. Ideally such provisions should be generous in terms of the number of days and require minimal (if any) reduction in salary.

Goal 5.2: More Effective Nutrition-Sensitive Social Protection				
#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
1	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No (1)	Neutral	0	
	No (2)	Conflicting	-2	R: Revise national growth strategies to strengthen development cooperation with international development agencies and donors regarding international nutrition-related social protection initiatives.
2	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider establishing national marketing platforms or commodity boards that help absorb surplus food on the farm spot markets and provide them to consumers at affordable prices throughout the year, including during food crises.

Goal 6.1: Empowerment of Women and Girls to Participate in Food System Transformation				
#	Response	Appraisal	Score	Potential Recommendation (R) and/or Trade-off (T)
1	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider mainstreaming policies and support systems that promote women's empowerment and their financial inclusion in economic activities including the food system by using a gender lens on national monetary policies. In cases where the broader economic policy/strategy recognises the need to empower women, policy coherence can be improved by ensuring that gender is mainstreamed in all policies.
2	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider designing and implementing fiscal policies and support systems that specifically target women's empowerment and their financial inclusion in economic activities such as tax rebates and tax exemptions.
3	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider enacting laws to ensure equal remuneration for work of equal value while ensuring commitment to the implementation of such law in practice.
4	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Conflicting	-2	R: Consider enacting laws to prohibit gender discrimination in relation to access to credit facilities and ensuring commitment to implementing these laws in practice.
5	Yes	Reinforcing	2	
	No	Neutral	0	R: Consider providing support for women's producer cooperatives or economic empowerment groups, such as through provision of capacity strengthening, technical assistance for adherence to certification standards, facilitation of access to finance.

