



Diagnosing Policy Coherence for Food Systems Results from Indonesia





Food systems policy coherence is the alignment of policies that affect the food system with the aim of achieving health, environmental, social, and economic goals, to ensure that policies designed to improve one food system outcome do not undermine others and, where possible, take advantage of synergies across policy areas to achieve better outcomes for all¹.

The Food Systems Policy Coherence Diagnostic Tool offers a practical methodology to assess food systems policy coherence and provide actionable recommendations for enhancing it. It was applied to Indonesia in 2025 via an extensive document review and expert consultations.

Structures & Mechanisms

The first module of the tool examines whether there are structures and mechanisms in place that would increase the

likelihood of achieving policy coherence. The results for Indonesia, shown below, indicate that Indonesia's food system policy landscape is generally very strong when it comes to supporting potential policy coherence. It has framework documents to guide food system transformation, backed up by political commitment, coordination structures, and monitoring systems, with steps toward implementation—though these need to be followed through to completion.

1. Adapted from Parsons & Hawkes. 2019. Policy Coherence in Food Systems.

Indonesia's Structures and Mechanisms in Support of Food System Policy Coherence

Domain	Analysis and Recommendations
Framework Documents	Indonesia has a food systems pathway document submitted through the UNFSS, which was developed with broad stakeholder input and covers a wide set of food system domains, including synergies and trade-off among them. It contains a vision for the future, alongside objectives, targets , and measures for reaching them. This creates a strong foundation for their food system transformation process.
Political Commitment	The pathway was endorsed at UNFSS 2021 by both President Joko Widodo and Minister of Agriculture Syahrul Yasin Limpo, demonstrating high-level political commitment .
Capacity & Implementation	Indonesia's Strategic National Pathway for Food Systems Transformation has not yet been formally adopted through the government's official processes, but significant steps have been taken to integrate its principles into national policy frameworks, and government staff capacity building on food systems topics is underway. In 2024, Indonesia took significant steps to strengthen food system governance through new policies and the integration of food system transformation in the long-term development plan , RPJPN 2025–2045, which positions food systems as a core pillar of national development. The country has also initiated work on an action plan and costed investment plan to operationalise the pathway. It is important that these efforts continue to full implementation in the future.
Coordination Structures	Coordination is supported by national platforms that facilitate discussion among sectors on food systems topics, food systems champions/advocates within government, and a lead institution responsible for overseeing food systems transformation, the Coordinating Ministry for Food Affairs (Kemenko Pangan), with Bappenas and the National Food Agency also playing key roles in coordination.
Inclusivity, Stakeholder Engagement & Voice	Inclusivity and stakeholder engagement in food systems transformation in Indonesia were supported by diverse dialogues in the run-up to the UNFSS (informing the development of the pathway). They continue to be bolstered by mechanisms for expert consultation on food systems policies and including the voices of non-technical, non-government stakeholders in policy decision-making. Recent national public consultations and multi-stakeholder dialogues have expanded participation in food system policymaking; they should be institutionalised and expanded to reach subnational levels.
Monitoring & Accountability	Indonesia's pathway is supported by key performance indicators; reporting milestones; and responsibilities and mechanisms for reporting. While some progress has been made in reporting on food systems indicators, this has not been through a unified framework tied to the pathway; there is opportunity to improve the alignment and expand the scope of this reporting including through the Food Security and Vulnerability Atlas that is under development. Regulatory Impact Assessments are used to assess cross-sectoral policy impacts, which can help to flag trade-offs. While the pathway is subject to review and revision, the period for this is not clearly specified; accountability could be strengthened by doing so.
Note: Green shading indicates domains where systems are highly supportive of coherence; yellow where they are moderately highly supportive; orange where they are only somewhat supportive, and red where they are generally not supportive.	

Policy Conflicts & Synergies

Module 2 considers the conflicts and synergies between existing policies across six sectors (shown in the columns of the table below) and the achievement of key goals of food system transformation, drawn from the United Nations Food Systems Summit process and shown in the rows of the table below.

Results for Indonesia are shown in the shading of each cell in the table, following the legend shown below the table. For example, the dark green shading in the first cell indicates that agriculture policies reviewed are highly coherent with (supporting of) the goal of increasing the supply of main staple crops, which contributes to achieving zero hunger. In contrast, environment policies are shown to be somewhat incoherent with the goal of increasing nutritious food consumption to contribute to healthy diets for all.

Coherence between Indonesia's Policies and Key Food System Goals

		Agriculture	Health	Environment	Trade	Social	Industrial, Economic & Monetary
Zero Hunger	Increased supply of main staples						
	Affordable prices for main staples						
Climate Resilience	Adaptation						
	Climate change mitigation						
Healthy Diets	More nutritious food consumption						
	Less unhealthy food consumption						
	Reduction of Food Loss & Waste						
Decent Work	Adequate wages for food system workers						
	Effective nutrition-sensitive social protection						
	Empowerment of Women & Girls						
LEGEND		Highly Coherent	Somewhat coherent	Neither coherent nor incoherent	Somewhat incoherent	Highly incoherent	Not assessed
Policies reviewed in this sector were very much in line with achieving this goal				Policies reviewed in this sector were generally not in line with achieving this goal			



Encouragingly, most policy areas were found to be highly coherent with most food systems goals. This was particularly true for social, trade, environment, and health policies. For example, areas of strength included:



Social policies help reduce hunger through social protection targeting poor rural households, cash transfers for vulnerable households, and constitutional recognition of the Right to Food. They support climate change adaptation by including drought-tolerant seeds in public distributions of agricultural inputs and providing cash transfers and in-kind assistance during natural disasters.



Health policies support healthy diets by supporting informational campaigns on healthy eating, mandatory fortification of staple foods, and limitations on advertising unhealthy foods, among others. However, they are somewhat incoherent with goals of climate change mitigation, including

because they do not include support for promoting dietary shifts towards lower-emissions nutritious foods.



Trade policies support zero hunger by having low tariffs on imports of staple foods, agricultural inputs, and most agricultural machinery.

They support climate change mitigation through environmental sustainability clauses in trade agreements and taxes on export of products whose production may cause environmental damage.



Environmental policies support women's empowerment by recognising that women are differentially affected by climate change and providing guidelines for mainstreaming gender issues in climate change projects, as well as supporting women's rights to land.



More incoherence was found when it came to **agricultural policies**.

While these were highly coherent with the goal of reducing hunger, such as through research and development and extension services focused on staple crops, they were less coherent with goals of increasing consumption of healthy diets. For example, there is limited prioritisation of nutrient-dense non-staples (such as fruits and vegetables) in R&D, subsidised input provision, or extension services; instead, these tend to favour staple crops and commercial cash crops like oil palm. This might limit production or productivity of highly nutritious foods, affecting their prices and thus people's ability to access them. Subsidies for the production of oilseeds and sugar crops could also lead to these less healthy foods (and products containing them) being over-consumed, in conflict with the goal of reducing consumption of unhealthy foods.



Industrial, economic, and monetary policies also showed several areas of incoherence or neither coherence nor

incoherence. For example, they support climate change adaptation through strategies for sustainable and climate-resilient growth, including climate-smart agriculture. However, fiscal and financial incentives for food system firms to adapt to climate change are limited. Moreover, while there are some economy-wide policies in place to provide minimum wages, these likely fall short of ensuring adequate earnings for food system workers.



Conclusion

There are some caveats to this analysis. First, some policies in Indonesia are decentralised, whereas this application was conducted at the national level. Relevant provincial-level policies and initiatives are thus not reflected, which may under- or overestimate the level of coherence. Second, policy is complex and dynamic, and the goals of food system transformation are numerous; this analysis considers only a limited number of food systems goals and policies at one point in time. In addition, it is not necessarily the case that areas of incoherence in policies should be seen as ‘bad’; there are some cases where incoherence may make sense, such as due to prioritisation across goals or political economy necessities.

Still, policy incoherence can sometimes lead to inefficiency and lower likelihood of achieving policy goals, as well as missed opportunities for leveraging synergies across policy areas where they exist. While achieving perfect coherence among all food-related policies across all outcomes is unlikely—and potentially undesirable, given the costs associated with coordination and alignment—by identifying and managing critical synergies and trade-offs, Indonesia's government and the stakeholders who support it can better align efforts towards achieving key goals. Persistent fragmentation, unclear roles, and missed coordination opportunities risk undermining Indonesia's food system transformation. With the new government in place, recent regulatory breakthroughs, and the ongoing development of the RPJMN 2025–2029, now is a critical moment to translate these findings into action.





You can access the tool and supporting resources here:



This work was produced 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



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