



# Diagnosing Policy Coherence for Food Systems

## Results from Tanzania







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 all<sup>1</sup>.

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 Tanzania 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 Tanzania, shown below, indicate that Tanzania's food system policy landscape is strong in providing the framework documents to guide food system transformation and that these are backed up by political commitment and coordination structures, but that there are areas to strengthen in terms of implementation, inclusive stakeholder engagement, and monitoring and accountability.

---

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



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

Domain	Analysis and Recommendations
<b>Framework Documents</b>	Tanzania has a food systems <b>pathway document</b> submitted through the UNFSS, which was developed with <b>broad stakeholder input</b> and covers a wide set of food system domains and contains a <b>vision</b> for the future, alongside <b>objectives, targets, and measures</b> for including them. This creates a strong foundation for their food system transformation process. The National Roadmap to Sustainable Food System Transformation by 2030 has also been developed as an accompaniment to the pathway document
<b>Political Commitment</b>	Tanzania's senior leadership has publicly supported this vision, including through the president's participation in UNFSS, demonstrating <b>high-level political commitment</b> . However, more could be done to ensure a sustained commitment to a food systems approach beyond electoral cycles; while a lack of commitment has not been noted yet, progress in operationalisation is currently delayed by election preparations.
<b>Capacity &amp; Implementation</b>	Tanzania has initiated the process of <b>formally adopting</b> the pathway, developing an <b>action plan</b> and costed <b>investment plan</b> to operationalise it, incorporating its priorities into <b>national policies and strategies</b> , and providing <b>capacity building</b> to government staff on food systems approaches. However, these processes have been delayed and need to be followed through to completion to ensure effective implementation.
<b>Coordination Structures</b>	Coordination is supported by the existence of food systems <b>champions/advocates</b> within government, as well as a <b>lead institution</b> designated as responsible for overseeing food systems transformation, the Presidential Food and Agriculture Delivery Council. Because this institution is under the oversight of the prime minister instead a sectoral ministry, it should be able to have influence over multiple sectors of government (e.g., Health, Environment), as needed for coherent policies. While there are some mechanisms in place to <b>engage different levels of government</b> (e.g., local and regional), these could be reinforced ensure their functioning and support coherence in policies across levels of government. It would also be helpful to have more government-led coordination across sectors and stakeholders on food systems topics.
<b>Inclusivity, Stakeholder Engagement &amp; Voice</b>	Tanzania had <b>inclusive dialogues</b> to develop its pathway. While mechanisms are in place for ongoing consultations with stakeholders on food system policy issues, these could be strengthened by ensuring they are <b>cross-sectoral</b> and include a <b>wide range</b> of non-governmental stakeholders (e.g., government, private sector, donors) and that they occur more regularly with a stronger focus on assessing progress towards commitments.
<b>Monitoring &amp; Accountability</b>	Monitoring and accountability are supported by <b>milestones</b> for review and reporting on the pathway, but this could be strengthened by pairing them with specific <b>mechanisms</b> for doing so. Developing detailed <b>key performance indicators (KPIs)</b> for the food systems pathway and designating <b>responsibilities</b> for monitoring would also help to strengthen monitoring process. Once these KPIs are developed, it will be important to regularly report publicly on the results of tracking them, data platforms such as a subnational Food Systems Dashboard could facilitate this. Stakeholders could also consider putting in place <b>mechanisms for routinely assessing potential impacts of policies</b> on different parts of the food system (i.e., synergies and trade-offs) and building staff capacity on using them.
<b>Note:</b> 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 Tanzania 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 (supportive of) the goal of increasing the supply of main staple crops, which contributes to achieving zero hunger. In contrast, trade policies are shown to be somewhat incoherent with the goal of increasing nutritious food consumption to contribute to healthy diets for all.

**Coherence between Tanzania'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			





Many policy areas were found to be highly coherent with most food systems goals. This was particularly true for health policies and industrial/economic/monetary policies.



For example, **health policies**

support climate change adaptation by recognising climate change as a threat to

health and working to prevent or manage vector-borne and heat-related illnesses.

They support women's empowerment by facilitating women's access to contraception and providing free or subsidised maternal and child healthcare. Coherence of nutrition goals with other sectors is supported by noting the roles of different (non-health) ministries in the draft implementation strategy for the National Food and Nutrition Policy. Specifically, that policy encourages consumption of nutritious food through mandatory fortification and efforts to strengthen the regulatory framework for fortification and biofortification, as well as through support for promotion of nutrient-dense foods. However, policies could do more to lower consumption of unhealthy foods by putting in place comprehensive food advertising regulations and standards for food provided in schools.



**Industrial, economic, and monetary policies** support

reduction in hunger by

recognising agriculture as a key

sector for growth and development in the Tanzania Development Vision 2050 and the

five-year development plan, by supporting staple crop value chains, and by encouraging

upgrading of rural infrastructure. They support climate change mitigation through

a commitment to green growth and to

reducing greenhouse gas emissions as well

as by providing tax incentives for adoption of environmentally sustainable practices.



**Social policies** promote decent

work by providing social security

to food system workers and

encouraging compliance with

labour laws that protect workers (though there may be gaps in coverage and

implementation in both areas). They help reduce hunger through social protection

policies targeting poor rural households, constitutional recognition of the Right to

Food, and food subsidies or transfers for

the most vulnerable households. However,

these policies may not be as reinforcing of

the healthy diets goal, as they do not include



requirements for providing nutritious foods, such as fortified or biofortified foods, within these programmes, nor do they regulate provision of healthy foods in workplace canteens.



**Agricultural policies** are highly coherent with goals of reducing hunger, such as through research and development and extension services focused on staples, as well as with increasing consumption of nutritious foods, such as through support for biofortification, extension services for horticultural crops, and support for cold chain infrastructure. The latter coherence is also supported by explicit mention of 'synergy among all nutrition-sensitive sectors' including agriculture in the National Food and Nutrition Policy. However, agriculture policies have some incoherencies with climate change mitigation, such as output-linked food production subsidies and fertiliser subsidies that could encourage overproduction and overuse of fertiliser, respectively. Similarly, subsidies and extension services for producers of oilseeds and sugar crops could potentially lead to overproduction and artificially low prices for consumers and processors; while some amount of fat is needed in a healthy diet, in general, excess supplies (or cheap prices) of edible oils could encourage overconsumption and excessive use in food processing, contradicting the goal of reducing consumption of unhealthy food.



**Environmental policies** also showed some areas of incoherence, such as potentially limiting access to home gardening by placing restrictions on the use of land for agriculture in urban and peri-urban areas, which could reduce access to nutritious foods and thus hinder attainment of the 'healthy diets' goal. Similarly, limits on fishing – while often motivated by important environmental goals and supportive of maintaining fish stocks for the future, could have short term conflicts with achieving more nutritious food consumption if they make fish (a highly nutritious food) more expensive or less available. At the same time, environmental policies were generally found to be reinforcing of women's empowerment goals through their recognition of how women are differentially impacted by climate change and face distinct barriers to adaptation, as well as by recognising equal rights of women to access, use, control, own, and inherit land.



**Trade policies** were the policy domain with the highest level of incoherence. For example, tariffs on imports of main staples as well as agricultural inputs could lead to higher prices, hindering efforts to achieve Zero Hunger. Similarly, tariffs on the importation of certain nutrient-dense foods and on the equipment needed for food fortification could have detrimental effects in terms of countering achievement of the 'healthy diets' goal.





## Conclusion

There are some caveats to this analysis.

First, this application was conducted at the national level, so relevant region, district-, or LGA-level policies and initiatives are 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, Tanzania's government and the stakeholders who support it can better align efforts towards achieving key goals.







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.