



POWER IN THE FOOD SYSTEM

Understanding trends and improving accountability

Workshop series report

Food Ethics Council

July 2005

Contents

1. Acknowledgements	2	Appendix 1: participants	16
2. Introduction	3	Appendix 2: speakers	19
3. Trends in Power	5	Appendix 3: feedback	22
4. Evaluating governance	8	Appendix 4: programmes	23
5. Improving accountability	10		
6. Making change happen	13		
7. Conclusion: three priorities	15		

Acknowledgements

The Food Ethics Council is very grateful to everyone who took part in the workshops on *Power in the food system* or contributed to the on-line forum. We would like to highlight the crucial contribution made by all the participants who chaired group discussions or took notes. We also owe special thanks to the seventeen people who delivered presentations at the workshops, whose names and biographies can be found in Appendix 2.

The workshops were generously supported by the Allen Lane Foundation and the Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust. They were chaired by Elizabeth Dowler, Jeanette Longfield and Geoff Tansey. This report was prepared by Tom MacMillan with assistance from Ann Baldrige.

Introduction

In May and July 2005, the Food Ethics Council held a series of three workshops on Power in the food system: understanding trends and improving accountability. The workshops were intended to help participants understand and respond to major shifts in power that are taking place within the food system. Specifically, they were designed to help the people involved to:

- Identify trends in the ways that food and agriculture are governed.
- Think critically about the results of those trends.
- Explore how consumers, farmers and other citizens can hold institutions of power to account.

We were particularly interested in three trends. The first is sometimes called the 'hollowing out' of the state. Powers traditionally associated with national governments are being shifted 'upwards' by globalisation and 'downwards' by devolution. A second important trend is towards regulation by the private sector. For example, it is increasingly the quality and safety standards set by retailers and other companies, rather than those set by governments, which matter most to producers and consumers. Third, we have seen an upsurge of civil society activity around food and agriculture, most notably in the shape of new international movements such as Via Campesina and Slow Food.

In advance of the first workshop we published a background paper that described these trends, and others, in greater detail. The paper also introduced two concepts that we used to structure the workshops, which recurred throughout the series: governance and accountability.

Though an awkward word, **governance** is a helpful concept because it refers to all sorts of processes of governing, such as policy-making and regulation, but recognises that those processes are not confined to government. It therefore focuses our attention on precisely the kinds of shifts in power that we suggested were most significant, such as the changing relationships between national, international and local institutions, and between the public sector and companies. The notion of governance also gets us to think about the big picture. It is not only about the capacity to govern how food is produced, consumed and distributed day-to-day, but also about who is able to influence the 'rules of the game'.

Our motivation for the workshop series was our concern that some trends in governance are contrary to the public interest, unjust or unsustainable. We wanted to know how governance could be improved. The background paper argued that **accountability** was a central feature of good governance. By accountability, we mean all sorts of mechanisms by which institutions exercising power can be held to account by the groups they affect. We do not simply mean liability or auditing processes. The key issue is perhaps less whether institutions are or are not accountable, but *to whom* they are accountable.

The three events focused on challenges and opportunities facing, respectively, government, business and civil society. Each day-long workshop began by discussing trends in governance, then debating examples of good and bad governance with a view to identifying priorities for change. The third session of each workshop focused on improving accountability and on making change happen. Each of these three sessions consisted of short presentations followed by structured discussions in small groups. The workshops ended with open discussions.

About forty people took part in each workshop. They included campaigners, researchers, civil servants, business people and writers. The diverse perspectives they brought to the workshops made the series a fertile environment for sharing and developing ideas. The emphasis of each workshop was on the group discussion sessions, and we are very grateful to all the participants who facilitated the discussions by chairing or taking notes. Lists of participants at each of the three workshops can be found in Appendix 1.

The seventeen speakers in the series brought a comparably broad range of knowledge and experience to the discussions. They included academics, business people from various sectors, campaigners and a politician. A

list of speakers, with short biographies, can be found in Appendix 2. We are very grateful for all their contributions, which were essential in stimulating and guiding the group discussions.

This report provides a summary of the workshop series. However, it is *not* a blow-by-blow account of each event. Our main objective has been to make the report useful. Therefore, whilst we have tried to reflect the range of discussions that took place and the diversity of opinion on many issues, we have been selective and have kept our account concise. We have not tried to capture every point that each speaker made or to present a detailed record of each group discussion. Indeed, instead of organising the report by workshop or by speaker, we have focused on the key themes that we think emerged. Only comments made by speakers during their presentations, or taken from an on-line forum running parallel to the series, are attributed.

During several sessions of the first two workshops, participants drew diagrams to illustrate different examples of governance in food and agriculture. The main purpose of these diagrams was to stimulate and structure discussion. We considered reproducing them but decided that the elaboration and explanation required in order to make them intelligible to readers exceeded the value our reproductions would add to this report.

This document is designed to be read alongside a series of related resources, all of which are available at www.foodethicscouncil.org:

- A background paper, published in advance, sets out the context of the workshops.
- The detailed workshop programme explains the structure of the series in detail, drawing on the background paper.
- Slides and notes from the workshop presentations provided by many of the speakers.
- Links to work by other organisations, suggested by people who took part in the workshops.
- An on-line forum featuring very helpful contributions around themes that emerged from the workshops.

This report replicates these on-line resources as little as possible.

Trends in power

The workshop series painted a picture of a food system undergoing profound changes, affecting almost every aspect of production and consumption. Tim Lang (City University) described these changes as a **revolution** transforming how food is produced, who produces it and where, how it is processed and distributed, how it is cooked and where we eat it. The drivers of this revolution, he argued, range from deliberate government policies, and specific challenges in health, the environment and the economy, to much broader cultural shifts.

Discussions at the workshops were wide-ranging, reflecting this systematic transformation in food and agriculture. However, one trend in power, towards **corporate concentration** in the food supply chain, emerged as particularly significant. At most stages of production, processing and distribution, the number of companies involved is diminishing and the market share of the largest players is growing. A new web-tool called the Market Share Matrix has been developed to map this increasing concentration internationally (www.marketsharematrix.org).

Corporate concentration raised a number of concerns:

- In some sectors it has created oligopolies, in which a small number of companies sell a large proportion of products or services, giving them much greater power to raise prices than they would have if there was more competition.
- Major oligopsonies are also emerging, in which a small number of companies account for a large proportion of demand, allowing them to force down purchase prices.
- The large size of companies means that regulatory structures designed for smaller firms are rendered less effective.
- The international operations of these large companies mean that national-scale regulatory structures, for example competition rules, cannot govern them in the public interest.
- The economic power of these companies gives them considerable political influence, enabling them to capture regulatory bodies regionally, nationally and internationally.
- Trade liberalisation has contributed to corporate concentration and the political clout of large companies enables them to promote further liberalisation through such fora as the World Trade Organisation (WTO). As a result of these mutually reinforcing processes, food security is coming to rely increasingly on international trade, which some participants felt increased the vulnerability of food-insecure countries.

Corporate concentration and power in certain sectors came under particularly strong scrutiny at the workshops. The **food services** sector, for example, was mentioned as one area where changes in the growing power of a few large companies was having a profound affect on peoples' lives in the UK. The growth of food services had been driven in part by public policies on procurement and approaches to contracting in organisations like hospitals and schools. These changes have gone hand in hand with deteriorating nutritional standards in public institutions and with deskilling in kitchens and in the home. Yet, at least until recently, they have escaped much public scrutiny.

Concentration in **food retail**, more than any other sector, generated discussion and divided opinion at the workshops. Bill Vorley (International Institute for Environment and Development) described how, in March 2005, Tesco, Asda, Sainsbury's and Morrisons/Safeway accounted for 76.5% of the UK grocery market. Tesco alone accounted for 29.6% of that figure. This situation has created a permanent price war. Yet, rather than denting the profit margins of these giant multiples, it is their suppliers who suffer. The UK Competition Commission has charted how retailers with a larger market share pay a lower price to suppliers. This is not just a problem for UK suppliers – a banana supplier in the Windward Islands, for instance, described how this situation created a “perverse transfer of wealth, by some of the supermarkets, from farmers and farm workers of developing countries to the consumers of developed countries”. Internationally, the oligopsony power of European retailers has been strengthened by producer-led food safety and quality assurance schemes.

At the second workshop, in particular, there was widespread agreement that retail concentration is detrimental to the interests of suppliers. Whether retail concentration and the permanent price war it has created benefits consumers, however, was another matter. Phil Evans (Which?) argued that consumers were benefiting from lower prices, and this really mattered to people living on a tight budget. Bill Vorley noted the high level of trust that consumers have in supermarkets, compared with Parliament, the church, the media and the monarchy. It was also suggested that retailers were the wrong target for consumer concerns, because they were much more responsive to consumers than branded food manufacturers.

By contrast, other participants highlighted the £2 billion profit that Tesco had recently posted, which suggested that the price war only pressed their margins so far. It was suggested that price cuts were not an effective way of addressing food poverty and, furthermore, that the UK's culture of cheap food needed to change in the interests of social and environmental responsibility. Participants also questioned whether supermarkets are really delivering on their other main promise to consumers – choice. One person remarked that “the mantra of choice imposes responsibility without power on consumers, which is delusional and oppressive”. At the very least, it was widely felt that the assumption that retail power benefits consumers should be questioned more seriously by policy makers.

As the background paper discussed, corporate concentration and trade liberalisation have implications for the powers of **national governments** as well as companies and consumers. Relative to large companies, the power of governments has been in decline. Yet, speaking at the first workshop, both Kevin Morgan (University of Cardiff) and Sue Dibb (National Consumer Council) argued that this did not mean states were powerless or that there were not many more things regulators could do to promote the public interest in the midst of the major changes happening in food and agriculture.

Kevin Morgan argued that “the most disempowering notion in the modern world is the notion that we are powerless in the face of some supposedly ineluctable process of 'globalisation'”. His vision of public procurement as a way for governments to promote systematic change via the food services sector was endorsed by many other participants in the first workshop.

Sue Dibb questioned whether current government initiatives to lighten the ‘burden’ of regulation on companies, such as the Hampton Review and the formation of a Better Regulation Executive, might run against the interest of consumers. Can we afford to leave safety, quality and other forms of regulation to supermarket ‘due diligence’ and supply chain management? She argued that we could not, and encouraged the Food Standards Agency to use the full range of regulatory measures in its armoury, including such tactics as naming and shaming.

While the workshops focused on the powers of companies and governments, there was also some discussion of what might be called **countervailing power**. Were there any trends that might counteract the effects of corporate concentration? Many participants argued that corporate concentration was a negative trend; what, then, would drive progressive change?

For some, **consumer power** offered hope for the future. They argued that retailers are highly sensitive to market trends, giving consumers considerable collective clout. They pointed to growing consumer awareness of health, social and environmental issues relating to foods, and to the expanding markets for fair trade and organic products.

Others were sceptical that consumer trends offered scope for the major changes they felt were needed in food and agriculture. One participant remarked that the supermarket shelf was overrated as a democratic forum – our democracy is in a sorry state if we have to make political choices about the countryside, labour standards and animal welfare when we are buying our food. Because consumer power is based on spending, it favours the preferences of the rich. Information is also a major constraint on capacity of consumers to exert change through their purchases, with several participants arguing for better labelling on issues such as food miles.

Indeed, as food retailers play a growing role in newspaper distribution, the capacity of the media to present critical information to consumers about food and agriculture may be compromised. The flip-side of the supermarkets' sensitivity to consumer concerns is their great capacity to appropriate new food movements, like fair trade and organic, meaning that efforts to develop 'alternative' systems of production and distribution face a continual risk of being reduced to the latest marketing niche.

Tom Wakeford (PEALS, University of Newcastle) argued that **mass mobilisation** by people exercising their power as citizens, rather than as consumers, offered the greatest hope for progressive change. He charted an encouraging trend in the way social movements legitimated their activities: the 'messianic' environmental movements of the 1970s and 1980s had centred on charismatic, white, male and middle class leaders; these had given way to 'mascot' movements, particularly in international development, where NGOs made marginalised people front page news but did little to secure them a long term voice; since the 1990s, with movements such as the Brazilian landless workers' movement (MST), 'mass participation' has begun to flourish. Civil society in the UK has much to learn from movements like the MST, because they show the need to open up spaces for people to voice their concerns and thereby catalyse grassroots political action. By contrast, as one person put it, at the moment in the UK we are not citizens but consumers of politics.

Where these different trends in power – in the private sector, the public sector and civil society – will lead is an open question. Tim Lang suggested that developments around a number of tipping points might prompt dramatic **change in coming years**. In particular, he highlighted the importance of water and oil scarcity in shaping who will exercise power within the food system. The past decade has seen an explosion in 'futures' research intended to help decision-makers think strategically about trends and future tipping points. These 'horizon-scanning' processes exacerbate the current maldistribution of power within the food system because they are being carried out almost exclusively in the interests of those 'up' the food chain, not in the interests of those 'below'.

Evaluating governance

The background paper distributed in advance of the workshop series argued that it is difficult to evaluate how power is exercised because there can be no apolitical standpoint from which to do so – in short, talking about good or bad governance can be another way of exercising power. It might be helpful to refer to ‘the public interest’ or similar concepts when thinking about good governance, but in practice there are often many publics, with different interests in an issue. For example, as one discussion group pointed out, the Food Standards Agency’s policies on Sudan-1 and organic food elicit quite different reactions from the stakeholder groups involved. Good governance for one group may be bad governance for another. The background paper therefore argued that efforts to evaluate governance might best focus on processes, rather than outcomes. Are they fair? Are systems of accountability in place?

During the workshops, speakers and participants discussed the pros and cons of many different examples of governance. These discussions focused on four broad categories of institution: public sector institutions in the UK; international agencies and public sector institutions in other countries; companies; and UK civil society.

Examples that were debated of good and bad practice in **public sector governance in the UK** included hospitals, schools, local government and Regional Development Agencies. One body that received particular attention was the Food Standards Agency (FSA). Some saw it as an example of good practice. The agency was set up five years ago with a remit to put consumers first in the aftermath of the BSE crisis. As a non-ministerial body that is accountable to a board of stakeholders, its institutional culture is strikingly different to the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food that preceded it. It places a premium on transparency, holding open meetings around the country and publishing all the research it commissions in the form it was received.

Whilst some participants felt that other public sector bodies could learn much from the FSA, a number of concerns were raised about the way it operates. It was felt that board membership should be more diverse and that the agency should listen to a broader range of stakeholders. Some argued that the FSA does not voice the full range of consumers’ views, and others felt the agency puts the interests of the food industries before those of consumers. Some participants who felt the FSA is an example of good practice were concerned that the agency’s powers were too weak for it to make a big difference.

Patrick Mulvany (Intermediate Technology Development Group) highlighted major crises of **governance in the international public sphere**:

- The number of the world’s hungry had increased since the World Food Summit in 1996 to 852 million, with 30,000 people dying daily.
- Small-scale farmers and fisherfolk are fast disappearing.
- Productive resources water and fisheries are declining.
- Agricultural ecosystems are seriously contaminated.
- Science and technology are out of the control of the people who are deemed most to need them.

These crises are the responsibility of governments. International agencies such as the UN Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) have been established with remits to address these challenges, but they have so far proved unable to do so.

Patrick Mulvany argued that civil society has been more articulate than governments at putting forward better ways of governing food and agriculture. The work of setting standards to implement the right to food, for example, has been led by civil society. In November 2004, FAO members adopted voluntary guidelines on implementation. Similarly, civil society has driven forward international efforts to protect agricultural biodiversity.

The discussions of international governance also touched on the experiences of other national governments than the UK. In particular, Devinder Sharma spoke about the way agriculture is perceived and governed by

Indian policy makers. He explained how, after years struggling to escape the 'ship to mouth' existence of colonial rule, India was embracing it again by relying on food imports. The insistence of policy makers that food and agriculture do not matter, he argued, reflects a serious failure to understand the geopolitical importance of food security. By governing a nation's food supply, other governments and companies acquire considerable power to influence its affairs.

Discussions about **private sector governance** focused on the capacity of UK regulators to govern the activities of supermarket buyers. Andrew George MP (Liberal Democrats), Duncan Swift (Grant Thornton UK) and Phil Evans (Which?) each offered different perspectives on the problems facing regulators and on how they should best respond.

Andrew George MP argued that the Supermarket Code of Conduct was too weak to prevent abusive buying practices by large retailers. He said that the Office of Fair Trading, which is responsible for the code, should grapple with this issue, not just ponder it. Farmers and suppliers who have suffered at the hands of supermarkets are reluctant to jeopardise their businesses by reporting cases of abuse, meaning that little evidence is available. He argued that naming and shaming would be a far greater sanction for malpractice than any fine, because of the degree to which supermarkets trade on their reputation with consumers.

Duncan Swift said that in his view 95% of dealings between supermarkets and their suppliers are fair, above board, give business certainty and are reasonably transparent. The supplier might not like the price but that is not the issue. However, in a small number of dealings (less than 5%), he is seeing abusive conduct by supermarket buyers, sufficient to put even large suppliers out of business. He gave examples of these 'scams', such as a supermarket buyer overestimating fresh produce demand and retrospectively raising the quality specification in order to reduce qualifying supplies. He suggested that governance could be improved by looking for evidence of buyer malpractice in cases of major supply business insolvency, by establishing an independent regulator, and by placing an obligation on supermarkets to set out key supply terms in writing.

Phil Evans argued that more regulation was not what was needed: if abuse occurred in only 5% of cases, why over-regulate the other 95%? He agreed with Duncan Swift that written terms and effective auditing would improve the governance of retail purchasing. He also recognised the lack of evidence of malpractice. However, he noted that the lack of evidence might, in principle, be because abusive practices are not widespread. One of his main concerns was that EU-wide standards on safety and quality, set by industry bodies or by the European Commission, had the effect of keeping out imports from poor countries and keeping consumer prices high.

Paul Sander-Jackson (Somerset Food Links) gave two examples of successful **local civil society responses** to macro-scale failures of governance. In the first case, Somerset Food Links had connected producer and consumer interests through farmers' markets, counteracting at a local level the failures to govern retail activity that have been described above. With micro-level government support, the organisation had created a situation where farmers could set prices and make money, and where consumers benefited from a greater range of outlets from which to buy their food.

Paul Sander Jackson's second example was school meals. The government deregulated school meals services with the effect that private companies were funded by the state to sell unhealthy food to children, with major health consequences. Somerset Food Links has helped to counteract this failure by working with Somerset County Services to change their procurement practices and make health a priority. Over a six-month period the services have moved to 20% local sourcing.

Improving accountability

At the first two workshops there was some discussion about **the meaning of accountability**. In preparing the workshops, we had taken it to encompass all sorts of mechanisms by which institutions exercising power could be held to account by the groups they affected. We did not simply mean liability or auditing processes. The key issue is perhaps less whether institutions are or are not accountable, but *to whom* they are accountable.

One participant suggested that the concept of accountability might be of limited use in international discussions because it did not translate well into many other languages. Other participants suggested that it would be more useful to talk about **responsibility** than accountability. Much of our work is concerned with responsibilities and with what different people and organisations ought to do – we thought that in these workshops it would be more useful to focus on accountability, which is about having mechanisms in place to ensure responsibilities are fulfilled. The challenge in improving accountability is not only to improve the ways that people and organisations are held to account for responsibilities that are already known or codified in law, but also to strengthen mechanisms for holding them to account for the broader moral responsibilities they may have to stakeholder groups or the public at large.

The discussions and workshops highlighted two further distinctions, in addition to that between accountability and responsibility. On the one hand, participants distinguished between accountability and **responsiveness**. Supermarkets were agreed to be highly responsive to the preferences of certain groups of consumers and more adept than government bureaucracies at handling consumer demands. Strictly speaking, however, they have few direct responsibilities to consumers, and they are accountable primarily to their shareholders rather than to people who buy their products.

On the other hand, a second distinction was drawn between accountability and **trust**. Andy Stirling (SPRU, University of Sussex) related how, in the aftermath of crises of public confidence around BSE and genetically modified (GM) foods, some efforts to build public trust in science and technology relied on decreasing public scrutiny. This might build a fragile public trust in the short-term, but at the expense of longer-term public confidence which relies on public accountability. Andy Stirling proposed that aiming for sustainability, precaution and participation, rather than aiming for trust, were ways to build greater public accountability into regulation and innovation.

Nick Robins (Henderson Global Investors) suggested that institutions must meet three criteria in order to be accountable:

- They must involve in decision-making the constituencies to whom they are responsible.
- They must explain or be transparent in their activities.
- There must be mechanisms of sanction in cases of malpractice.

Many of the suggestions that were made at the workshops for improving the public accountability of institutions governing food and agriculture fell under these three headings.

The issue of **involvement** arose in discussions around the question of to whom different institutions were accountable. Nick Robins explained that the company directors have a fiduciary duty to put the interests of their shareholders first. They are not responsible or accountable to other stakeholders except, perhaps, where health and safety are concerned. In turn the limited liability of shareholders means that they have few formal responsibilities to the public at large.

So, the ownership structure of an organisation affects which constituencies it needs to involve in its activities. Co-operatives, such as Waitrose and the Co-operative Group, involve their members in decision-making. These members are not shareholders in Waitrose and the Co-operative Group, but rather they are workers and customers respectively. However, ownership is not sufficient to ensure involvement. Nick Robins pointed

out that whilst the ownership of shares in companies is actually widely distributed nowadays, particularly through pension funds, in practice most of us are not involved in the activities of these companies we indirectly 'own'. He quoted business guru Peter Drucker to the effect that "the people now own capitalism but nobody has told them". Organisations such as Fair Shares help pension funds channel their power as investors towards the public interest.

Many people insisted that the moral responsibilities of companies and public bodies extended beyond the shareholders or immediate stakeholders to whom they were made formally responsible, and that they therefore ought to involve this wider constituency. In the private sector it was suggested that companies such as supermarkets could begin to be held to account for these wider responsibilities by reporting to multi-stakeholder bodies, including producer and consumer interests. The examples were given of Race to the Top, which focused on UK supermarkets, and of the banana-focused work being done by Banana Link.

Public sector bodies should extend involvement, it was argued, by devoting greater resources to citizen panels and processes. In particular, they should invest more in community development and youth work to help marginalised (and even unpopular) voices get heard. Parish planning processes undertaken by the Countryside Agency were suggested as an interesting model. Internationally there was felt to be a serious need for governments to ensure that policy processes on food and agriculture were transparent, open to the public and involved small-scale producers.

The idea that organisations have a need to **explain** their activities arose in discussions about what different organisations should be accountable for. Many felt there is a need for companies and public bodies to be explicit about their moral responsibilities, whether those relate to public health, food safety, environmental sustainability or other issues, and about their actions, so as to help people identify whether those responsibilities are being met. One advantage of clearly explaining responsibilities and actions is that it becomes more difficult to pass the buck if something goes wrong.

Much of the discussion focused on the benefits of making better information available to consumers and the wider public. Food labelling could be greatly improved, for example. At the moment ingredient labels are not required to mention everything in a product – enzymes used in breadmaking, for instance, can be left off the label. Some participants debated the pros and cons of having food labels that not only revealed the distance a food had travelled but also the mode of transport it had taken.

In general poor traceability through the food chain was considered to compromise accountability. The idea of two-way traceability – from producers to consumers and vice-versa – was suggested as a way of increasing accountability 'down' the food chain as well as 'up' it. The accountability of supermarkets to producers might also be improved by requiring them to declare their purchase prices. Schemes of this sort had been trialled in France and discussed in Canada. Supermarkets could also be audited against a framework of issues, including such factors as their impact on producers in poor countries.

Fewer suggestions were made at the workshops for improving the way public bodies explain their responsibilities and their actions. One suggestion was that parliamentary select committees should be given greater resources to scrutinise the work of government departments and agencies. It was noted, however, that the limited specialist knowledge of MPs was sometimes an obstacle to effective scrutiny. It was also noted that across the board, in the public and private sectors, it was important to protect whistle-blowers. Another general point was that clear, mandatory and accessible public complaints procedures were crucial.

Much of the discussion about improving accountability centred on **mechanisms for sanction**. What should happen if institutions don't meet their responsibilities? The purpose of these mechanisms is not simply to achieve retrospective compensation or redress for wrongdoing, but also to act as a disincentive for malpractice in the future. The great majority of this discussion focused on things that governments could do to address malpractice by businesses.

Participants at the workshops debated the relative merits of many different mechanisms for sanction. For example the idea of **naming and shaming**, discussed both by Sue Dibb and Andrew George, was considered to be a powerful measure by some but weak by others, depending partly on the sector and form of malpractice in question.

Competition regulation was the focus of particularly intense discussion, especially in relation to food retail. Many participants saw stronger competition regulation as essential in addressing problems associated with corporate concentration. Strong competition regulation would make the market a more effective mechanism for sanctioning corporate malpractice. Several people suggested that national competition rules are not sufficient – international business regulation is urgently needed.

The idea that regulators could harness consumer and investment markets as a powerful mechanism for sanctioning companies, whether through business regulation or by naming and shaming, attracted considerable interest.

Kavita Prakash-Mani (SustainAbility) discussed **liability** as mechanism for sanctioning malpractice. She argued that the landscape of liability was shifting, with new forms of 'moral liability' emerging in addition to legal liability and extending legal liabilities into new areas. Whereas legal liabilities are worked out in a court of law and often settled financially, moral liabilities are established in the court of public opinion and affect public goodwill towards a company. Moral liability over issues such as GM foods might affect a company via consumer boycotts or campaigns that damaged sales or disrupted operations. Kavita described food companies' increasing legal, insurance and financial liabilities around obesity, asking whether food is "the new tobacco". She recommended that governments help companies respond progressively to emerging moral liabilities by providing leadership, setting priorities and encouraging multi-stakeholder dialogue.

Not all the discussions about improving accountability concerned mechanisms for involving stakeholders, explaining actions or sanctioning malpractice. There was some general discussion about the importance of the **scale** of an organisation in ensuring accountability. Some participants suggested that smaller organisations, which were closer to their stakeholders, could more easily be held to account. They suggested that small organisations were more vulnerable than big ones and could more easily be sanctioned for malpractice. Other participants argued that large companies might be more accountable, because they have more to lose. It was suggested that the notion of accountability should be used carefully in relation to large bureaucracies, which might attempt to improve accountability by more detailed auditing, diverting resources from service provision.

Making change happen

It is one thing to know what improved public accountability might look like. It is quite another for citizens and NGOs actually to help make companies and public bodies more accountable. The strategies discussed at the workshop fell along a continuum between those that focused on challenging bad practice within the food system to those that focused on creating entirely different ways of producing, distributing and consuming food.

Different **tools and campaign ideas** for challenging bad practice were discussed at some length, particularly in the third workshop. Campaigners were encouraged to use the new rules on access to information, in place since January 2005, to unearth information about companies and public bodies that was not previously available. The internet was also discussed as a medium for catalysing change. One participant suggested that blogging might offer a way for farmers and suppliers to gather anonymous evidence of abusive practices by supermarkets. It was suggested that NGOs in food-insecure countries might litigate in domestic courts to promote the right to food. Compassion in World Farming's 'eat less meat' campaign was identified as an interesting case study by several discussion groups, because it linked social, environmental and animal welfare concerns around a very specific objective.

Campaign strategies for challenging **the power of large companies** received particular attention. Alistair Smith (Banana Link) suggested:

- Lobbying for governmental and intergovernmental legislation and monitoring.
- Mapping examples of corporate malpractice.
- Building networks of civil society actors, ensuring women's participation at all levels.
- Mobilising people along the food chain to put sustainability on corporate agendas.
- Undertaking and regularly updating collective analyses of power.
- Raising citizens' awareness of the hidden costs of cheap food.
- Organising multi-stakeholder fora with a common civil society agenda.
- Engaging critically with voluntary standards initiatives.
- Long-term commitments from civil society actors at the outset of any such campaign.

Additional ideas discussed in groups included:

- Highlighting the victims of corporate malpractice, including small companies that go out of business.
- Identifying liabilities and undertaking legal action.
- Publicising food-related health problems, in collaboration with scientists and the media.
- Drawing public attention to examples of good practice and forming partnerships with such businesses.

In the on-line forum, Gene Campaign, based in India, proposed that civil society should establish an international fund to create a certification process for companies, foods, farmers and producers that are contributing to efforts to end world hunger. Certification criteria would include their treatment of suppliers, input standards, market share, consumer responsiveness, corporate giving and roles in promoting food security.

Questions were raised at the workshops about the **effectiveness of alternative public campaign strategies**. Do slogans like 'make poverty history' work or do they trivialise issues? How useful is it to involve celebrities such as Jamie Oliver?

Doug Parr (Greenpeace) argued that the success of NGO campaigns depends on three factors. They need allies and a broad base of public support if any changes that are achieved are not to be fragile. They need a twin-track approach, working both inside and outside the institutions they are trying to change. NGOs also need to practice what they preach, including being publicly accountable themselves. The reasons for doing the

latter are not only that the failure to do so poses a risk to the reputations of NGOs, but also because it improves the quality of their work and is the right way to behave.

Numerous suggestions were made for **working with existing institutions** to improve their performance. One proposal was for individuals to encourage progressive procurement strategies in local bodies such as schools and hospitals, for instance by sitting on their boards. It was proposed that independent Food Policy Boards could be established at the local level, providing a mechanism through which representative groups of stakeholders could hold public bodies to account. NGOs were encouraged to work with trade unions and investors. Nick Robins described some of the ways that NGOs could work with investors to change corporate practice. These included awarding best in class, though this could be difficult if corporate concentration means that 'classes' are small, and influencing the reputation of a company in the investment community. He noted that the campaigning skills you need to stop malpractice are not the same as the legal skills needed to change company law, suggesting that NGOs needed to build new alliances and gain new skills. A note of caution was sounded by one participant who had previously worked with investors, remarking that they had found it difficult, in practice, to identify common ground.

Warren Carter (Moulsecoomb Forest Garden and Wildlife Project) argued that the best way for people to make change happen was to do something about it themselves. The government is too close to industry and public bodies spend too much time talking, so it is up to **social movements to take the lead**. He described how the flourishing Moulsecoomb Forest Garden and Wildlife Project in Brighton, though run on a shoestring, enables local children and adults to grow and learn about food. It is very popular with teachers in the local area and beyond, who arrange class visits to the project under science curricula.

The account of the Moulsecoomb project inspired several participants in the third workshop. One said she would campaign for all schools to have such gardens. Another said she would try to begin growing food on an unused area of land near her home. Many other approaches towards building systems of food production and consumption outside of the mainstream were discussed, such as farmers' markets, box schemes and community supported agriculture. One person suggested that credit could be a limiting factor in establishing such projects. He suggested developing local finance systems, similar to credit unions, which would channel local money into local food projects. He noted that only a relatively small proportion of household food expenditure would need to be invested in such finance systems in order to develop new food networks on a significant scale.

One group in the first workshop voiced a sentiment that was expressed at many points in the series: to make change happen, civil society needs to put the politics back into food!

Conclusion: three priorities

The workshop series was designed as a learning process for all involved. In that it succeeded, with many participants leaving the events with new information, new ideas and new contacts. The series was not meant to be an exercise in building consensus over an agenda for improving accountability in the food system, and no such consensus was forthcoming.

Three approaches to improving accountability struck us as being particularly important. First was the progressive potential of **public sector procurement**. Kevin Morgan argued that improvements in public procurement face three surmountable challenges. First, UK and EU regulation can obstruct, though it does not prevent, improvements. Second, improvements come at a short-term cost. The Scottish Executive's 'Hungry for success' programme cost £63 million, for example. Third, the organisations in question may lack the capacity to undertake improvements without external help. It is absolutely worth addressing these challenges, he argued, because changing procurement practices in organisations like schools, hospitals and prisons could help to reduce oil dependency by increasing local sourcing, improve peoples diets, especially in schools, and even encourage high labour standards in food production. The newly formed Sustainable Procurement Task Force may be a good place to focus campaigns to improve public sector procurement in England.

A second issue that stood out from the discussions at the workshop was the need for more robust **business regulation**. In the UK, this was felt by many participants to be crucial if problems associated with the growing concentration and power of supermarkets were to be addressed. Multiple retailers also featured in discussions of international corporate power, but it was noted that concentration ratios in input supply, processing and distribution are also very high. Alistair Smith's comments on the on-line forum highlight the complexity of addressing corporate power through competition rules, describing a recent instance where a very powerful retailer allegedly instigated an anti-trust investigation against much smaller banana suppliers. The presentations at the second workshop by Duncan Swift and Nick Robins highlighted the need for campaign organisations to gain new skills in pursuit of business regulation, and demonstrated the potential for finding unlikely allies from within the private sector.

Finally, we feel that the notion of **food sovereignty**, introduced to the workshops by Patrick Mulvany and Devinder Sharma, offers both a vision of a more equitable food system and suggests means to achieve it. Developed in the 1990s by the global farmers' movement Via Campesina, food sovereignty is a policy framework that puts the needs of the poor and hungry at the top of the agenda.

Food sovereignty has four main pillars:

1. Right to food, adopting a rights-based approach to agricultural and food policies that will progressively eliminate hunger and malnutrition.
2. Access to productive resources, such as land and water, for smallholder farmers, pastoralists, fisherfolk and indigenous peoples.
3. Mainstreaming agro-ecological production, producing food predominantly for local markets and domestic consumption.
4. Trade and local markets, promoting just trade policies which enable communities and countries vulnerable to hunger and malnutrition to produce sufficient quantities of safe and secure food.

Food sovereignty is becoming a focal point for many civil society organisations working on food and agriculture. Like public procurement and business regulation, its potential to change the way power is distributed for the better is hotly debated within civil society and beyond. What was clear from the workshops, however, is that very few people support the current policy fashions of treating agriculture as an industry like any other and acting as if food does not matter. This series of events underscored how much food and agriculture *do matter*, to people's lives and livelihoods, to animal welfare and to the environment.

Appendix 1: participants

Power in the food system: workshop 1, government

25 May 2005, RIGB Rooms

Participant	Organisation
Dino Adriano	
John Allen	Open University
Joelle Appleby	Food Standards Agency
Ann Baldrige	Food Ethics Council
Noe Brito	Food Ethics Council
Prof. Peter Bunyan	BCPC
Ian Burgess	Co-operative Retail
Bryony Butland	Foresight - OST
Tamasin Cave	
Pat Clark	UCL
Joanna Collins	Sustainable Consumption Roundtable
Sarah Davies	East Sussex Food & Health Partnership
Laura Davis	Warwick University
Clare Devereux	Food Matters
Sue Dibb	National Consumer Council
Liz Dowler	University of Warwick; Food Ethics Council
Anita Eves	University of Surrey
Michele Field	Freelance journalist
David Goodman	University of California, Santa Cruz; visiting Birkbeck
Justin Greaves	University of Warwick
Miriam Greenwood	City University
Jesse Griffiths	RSPB
Kim Hammond	University of Oxford
Meri Juntti	University of East Anglia
Tom MacMillan	Food Ethics Council
Ben Mephram	Centre for Applied Bioethics, Nottingham; Food Ethics Council
Kevin Morgan	Cardiff University
Patrick Mulvany	Intermediate Technology Development Group (ITDG)
David Oakley-Hill	The Waste Book
James Petts	Countryside Agency
Kavita Prakash-Mani	SustainAbility
Emma Roe	EU Welfare Quality Research Program
Paul Sander Jackson	Somerset Food Links
Doris Schroeder	University of Central Lancaster; Food Ethics Council
Claire Skinner	Forum for the Future
Katie Stafford	Marks and Spencer
Andy Stirling	SPRU, University of Sussex
Geoff Tansey	Freelance consultant; Food Ethics Council
Monica Truninger	University of Bangor
John Verrall	Food Ethics Council
Andrew Whitley	Bread Matters

Power in the food system: workshop 2, business
26th May 2005, RIGB Rooms

Participant	Organisation
Ann Baldridge	Food Ethics Council
Noe Brito	Food Ethics Council
Jessamyn Cain	Food Ethics Council
Tamasin Cave	
Pat Clark	University College London
Patrick Cunningham	Trinity College of Dublin
Laura Davis	Warwick
Michael Doel	Defra
Liz Dowler	University of Warwick; Food Ethics Council
Jane Eastham	Sheffield Hallam University
Hattie Ellis	Food writer and author
Kathryn Fahy	Lancaster University
John Fisher	BCPC
David Goodman	University of California, Santa Cruz
Miriam Greenwood	City University
Jesse Griffiths	RSPB
Meri Juntti	University of East Anglia
Jeanette Longfield	Sustain; Food Ethics Council
Tom MacMillan	Food Ethics Council
Julian Oram	Action Aid
Pete Riley	Five Year Freeze
Nick Robbins	Henderson Global Investors
Emma Roe	Cardiff University
Doris Schroeder	University of Central Lancaster; Food Ethics Council
Claire Skinner	Forum for the Future
Alistair Smith	Banana Link
Olliver Southgate	CIWF
Katie Stafford	Mark & Spencer
Rachel Sutton	UK Food Group
Duncan Swift	Grant Thornton UK
Steven Tait	Freedom Food
Geoff Tansey	Freelance consultant; Food Ethics Council
Monica Truninger	University of Bangor
Bill Vorley	IIED
James Walton	IGD
Sarah Whatmore	University of Oxford
Andew Whitley	Bread Matters

Power in the food system: workshop 3, civil society

5th July 2005, Friends House

Participant	Organisation
Dino Adriano	
Sam Burcher	Science in Society magazine
Kerry Burgess	CIWF
Warren Carter	Moulsecoomb Forest Garden
Pat Clark	UCL
Alison Craig	Pesticide Action Network UK
Rachel Dechenne	City University
Tina Deubert	Lewes Farmers Market
Clare Devereux	Food Matters
Liz Dowler	University of Warwick; FEC
Joyce D'Silva	CIWF
Jane Eastham	Sheffield Hallam University
Kathryn Fahy	Lancaster University
Michele Field	Freelance journalist
Alexandra Gonzalez	RSPB
Miriam Greenwood	City University
Philippa Guest	Agronomica Ltd
Kim Hammond	University of Oxford
Meri Juntti	University of East Anglia
Tim Lang	City University
Richard Lee	University of Newcastle-upon-Tyne
Les Levidow	Open University
Jeanette Longfield	Sustain; FEC
Matt Loose	SustainAbility
Tom MacMillan	Food Ethics Council
Mike McBane	Sympatico
Patrick Mulvany	ITDG - Practical Action
David Oakley-Hill	The Wastebook
Julian Oram	Action Aid
Doug Parr	Greenpeace
Nick Perks	Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust
Pete Riley	Five Year Freeze
Bruce Scholten	Durham University
Susanne Seymour	University of Nottingham
Devinder Sharma	
Rachel Sutton	UK Food Group
Geoff Tansey	Freelance consultant; FEC
Mark Tatchell	University of Warwick
Monica Truninger	University of Bangor
John Verrall	FEC
Tom Wakeford	PEALS, University of Newcastle
Sarah Whatmore	University of Oxford
Andrew Whitley	Bread Matters

Appendix 2: speaker biographies

Warren Carter helps run the Moulsecoomb Forest Garden Project (www.seedybusiness.org) based on eight allotments surrounded by various housing estates in Brighton. The project has regular workdays teaching people about gardening, puts on events such as bug hunts and herb walks, and works with local schools to try and get kids (and parents) to eat healthy food.

Sue Dibb is a Senior Policy Officer with the National Consumer Council's Sustainability Team. Sue leads on NCC's work to promote policies and practices that support public health and greater sustainability within the food chain. The NCC researches and campaigns on behalf of all consumers, particularly consumers who may be on low incomes or who may be disadvantaged in other ways. Sue has worked with various consumer and campaign organisations for over 20 years, including the Food Commission and Consumers International. She is currently a member of the Food Standards Agency's Consumer Committee and the Board of Assured Food Standards.

Liz Dowler is a qualified public health nutritionist with many years of research and professional experience in the social, public health and policy aspects of nutrition and food at local, national and international levels. Her current work in the Department of Sociology at the University of Warwick is on food and social policy, nutrition, health inequalities and evaluation of policy intervention in food. She is a member of the Food Ethics Council.

Phil Evans is a Principal Policy Adviser at the UK Consumers' Association where he is responsible for dealing with both competition policy investigations and submissions and developing its trade policy. He has written widely on matters of international economic policy and has authored numerous country reports on economic policy issues in developing countries. Phil has also developed and taught a range of courses on globalisation and international management issues at a number of universities.

Andrew George is MP for St. Ives and Liberal Democrat Shadow International Development Secretary. Until recently he has been Shadow Agriculture Secretary and Shadow Fisheries Minister. Since 1985 he has been living in Cornwall, where he was born, working for Cornwall Rural Community Council before becoming MP in 1992. He attended the Universities of Sussex and Oxford, specialising in agricultural economics.

Tim Lang has been Professor of Food Policy at City University since November 2002. He has worked widely across food and public health, as an academic, in the voluntary sector and as a consultant to local, national and international bodies. He was Director of the London Food Commission, 1984 to 1990, and Director of Parents for Safe Food, 1990-1994. He was Director of the Centre for Food Policy at Thames Valley University from 1994 to 2002, before moving to City University. His latest book (with Michael Heasman) is *Food wars: the global battle for minds, mouths and markets*.

Jeanette Longfield is Co-ordinator of Sustain: the alliance for better food and farming, a network of over 100 national organisations formed from the National Food Alliance (which she joined in 1992) and the Sustainable Agriculture Food and Environment Alliance. She has also worked as a Policy Analyst at the NCVO, and for the Coronary Prevention Group. She is a member of the Food Ethics Council.

Kevin Morgan is based at Cardiff University, where he is a member of the Urban and Regional Governance Research Group in the School of City and Regional Planning, and Director of The Regeneration Institute. He is researching and writing about local food, local procurement and school meals. His expertise covers areas such as economic regeneration, role of agriculture and the food chain therein, and legal and practical elements of public procurement of food. He has recently joined the Food Ethics Council.

Patrick Mulvany is Senior Policy Adviser to Intermediate Technology Development Group (ITDG), focusing especially on the governance of agricultural biodiversity for food and livelihood security and related genetic engineering issues. He is chair of the UK Food Group and an active participant in the civil society lobbies at the Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations. He is actively involved in the CSO/NGO International Planning Committee for Food Sovereignty and the informal CSO alliance on the Convention on

Biological Diversity. He has been a member of the Board of Trustees of Oxfam, Action Aid and other UK development organisations.

Doug Parr is Chief Scientist at Greenpeace UK. His focus is the many issues surrounding science and policy. He is interested in climate change, genetically modified crops/food and marine biodiversity as well as leading nascent work on nanotechnology. As chief scientist, he supervises the science and information functions within the organisation.

Kavita Prakash-Mani is an Associate Director with SustainAbility. She has been with SustainAbility since September 2000 and is currently leading SustainAbility's Emerging Economies programme. Kavita manages clients such as Unilever and Starbucks and is part of various other project teams. The projects include stakeholder engagement, issue identification, strategy development, new product development, reporting and assurance. Prior to SustainAbility, Kavita worked as a freelance consultant for the Prince of Wales International Business Leaders Forum in 2000 and as an Associate with the World Resources Institute's (WRI) Sustainable Enterprise Program from 1998-2000.

Nick Robins is Head of SRI Funds at Henderson Global Investors in London. At Henderson, he is responsible for co-ordinating the fund management and research functions for Henderson's £1 billion range of SRI funds for individual and institutional investors. Nick joined Henderson as Head of SRI Research in December 2000 with over a decade's experience with the sustainable development and corporate responsibility agenda. Prior to Henderson, Nick has worked for the International Institute for Environment and Development, the EC's Environment Directorate and the Economist Intelligence Unit.

Paul Sander Jackson is Chair of Food Links UK, sits on the Board of the Wessex Reinvestment Trust and is a Trustee of Sustain – the alliance for better food and farming. His initial background is in horticulture and education, initiating farm based-projects in Gloucestershire (a school farm) and Bristol (St Werburghs City Farm) before founding a community based co-operative business in Bristol (Riverside Garden Centre). More recently he has been working on rural and social enterprise and has been Project Manager and then Director of Somerset Food Links since it started in 1999.

Devinder Sharma is a distinguished writer, thinker and researcher. Trained as an agricultural scientist, Devinder has been with the *Indian express*, but quit active journalism to research food and trade policy. He has an honorary degree of Professor at Large from the CSK Himachal Pradesh Agricultural University (Palampur, India), is on the board of half a dozen national and international organizations, and chairs an independent New Delhi-based collective called the Forum for Biotechnology & Food Security. He has recently published three books: *GATT and India: the politics of agriculture*; *GATT to WTO: seeds of despair* and *In the famine trap*.

Alistair Smith is international co-ordinator of Banana Link, a charity that aims to alleviate poverty and prevent further environmental degradation in banana exporting communities, working towards a sustainable banana economy. Banana Link works co-operatively with partners in Latin America, the Caribbean, West Africa and the Philippines and with a network of European and North American organisations. Alistair is also involved in the UK working group of the Agribusiness Accountability Initiative, which promotes collaborative responses to corporate power in the global food system.

Andy Stirling works at SPRU – science and technology policy research, at Sussex University. He has a background in the natural sciences, a master's in archaeology and anthropology and a doctorate in science and technology policy. Formerly a Director of Greenpeace International, he has worked with a variety of academic, government, industry and public interest organisations in fields including nuclear waste, energy policy, chemicals strategies, genetically modified crops, food safety and public health. His research focuses on themes of scientific uncertainty, precaution, participation and transitions to more sustainable technologies. He

has served as a member of a number of UK and EC Government advisory committees, including, currently, the DEFRA Science Advisory Council.

Duncan Swift is a partner of Grant Thornton UK LLP and leads the firm's Food & Agribusiness Recovery Group. This market-leading industry group is focused exclusively on helping business owners and other stakeholders to restore the fortunes of ailing or financially distressed food production and processing businesses in the UK. Duncan has over 20 years of recovery experience advising both finance providers and management teams. His qualifications are BSc (Hons) Management Sciences, Chartered Accountant (ICAEW 1986), Licensed Insolvency Practitioner (ICAEW 1990) and he is currently concluding an MSc programme in Agricultural Business Management.

Geoff Tansey is a freelance writer and consultant specialising in food, agriculture and related intellectual property issues affecting trade and biodiversity. He was recently named as one of six successful applicants to the Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust's five-year Visionaries programme. He is an honorary research fellow in the Department of Peace Studies at Bradford University and a Director of the Food Ethics Council. He has written *The food system: a guide* and co-edited *The meat business: devouring a hungry planet*.

Bill Vorley leads the Sustainable Markets Group at International Institute for Environment and Development. He previously worked at the Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy in Minnesota, USA, and at the Leopold Centre for Sustainable Agriculture in Iowa. He has a wide experience of trade and agriculture issues, and an insiders' knowledge of the agribusiness sector, about which he has written extensively. Bill is one of the coordinators of the multi-partner Regoverning Markets programme, and has also brokered a process between civil society and multiple retailers around improving the social and environmental performance of the UK supermarket sector.

Tom Wakeford is an action researcher at the Policy, Ethics and Life Sciences Research Institute, University of Newcastle (www.peals.ncl.ac.uk). For the last ten years he has been involved in a wide variety of initiatives that have aimed to increase the political influence that consumers and smallholder farmers have on food and farming policies in the UK, India, Brazil and Southern Africa. During 2003 he led the multi-stakeholder controlled GM Jury process (www.GMJury.org). He is a columnist for Science and public affairs and author of the recent report, *Democratising technology*, published by ITDG (www.itdg.org). His most recent books are *Liaisons of life* (Wiley 2002) and *Teach yourself citizens juries* (PEALS 2003).

Appendix 3: feedback

The information below has been compiled from the feedback forms we received after each of the workshops. Participants were asked to provide comments and to rate two questions based on a five point scale (1 = very poor; 5 = excellent). The averages below for Question 1 (*How useful did you find the meeting?*) and Question 2 (*How well was the meeting organised?*) demonstrate that, on the whole, participants rated the workshops as good. We received many very helpful comments on how we could organise similar events better in the future. The comments reproduced below give a flavour the feedback we received.

Day	No. of forms	Useful?	Organised?	Positive feedback	Room for improvement
1	11	4.2	4.8	- Really enjoyed the day – very interesting and stimulating	- It was a bit too long - It would be good to focus on specific issues (e.g. obesity, food miles)
2	19*	4.3	4.6	- This has been an excellent forum for exchange and a chance to meet people from different sectors	- Would be good to have copies of overheads in packs in advance. It's frustrating to try and make full notes when speakers are going through their points very quickly
3	23	3.9	4.4	- Please organise these once a year – we must all stay in touch for support and info - Format was good – plenty of room for debate and thoughtful presentations	- More diversity in participants (e.g. farmers and big business) - Info on the first two workshops would have been helpful

* One participant chose not to rate Questions 1 and 2, noting that the scale appeared to be biased – there were three 'good' answers and two 'bad' answers. Because of this, we changed the intermediate (3 point) rating from 'satisfactory' to 'neutral' for the feedback form for the third workshop.

Appendix 4: programmes

Workshop 1: government, 25th May

The Main Library, The RiGB Rooms at the Royal Institution, 21 Albemarle Street, London W1S 4BS

- 10:00 Registration and refreshments**
- 10:30 Welcome – Dr Liz Dowler, University of Warwick (Chair)**
- 10:45 Session 1 – Trends and processes**
- 10:45 Professor Kevin Morgan, Cardiff University
School meals: the power of the public plate
- 10:55 Sue Dibb, National Consumer Council
Regulation: whose responsibility?
- 11:05 Questions
- 11:10 Discussions in small groups
- 11:55 Break – refreshments available**
- 12:05 Session 2 – Successes and failures**
- 12:05 Paul Sander Jackson, Somerset Food Links
Taking control locally
- 12:15 Patrick Mulvany, Intermediate Technology Development Group
Governing food and agriculture: towards food sovereignty
- 12:25 Questions
- 12:30 Discussions in small groups
- 13:15 Lunch**
- 14:00 Session 3 – Improving accountability**
- 14:00 Kavita Prakash-Mani, SustainAbility
Food: the new tobacco?
- 14:10 Dr Andy Stirling, SPRU, University of Sussex
Sustainability, precaution and participation: towards real accountability in the governance of food sector science and innovation
- 14:20 Questions
- 14:25 Discussions in small groups
- 15:10 Break – refreshments available**
- 15:30 Final plenary**
- 16:45 Ends**

Workshop 2: business, 26th May

The Main Library, The RiGB Rooms at the Royal Institution, 21 Albemarle Street, London W1S 4BS

10:00 Registration and refreshments

10:30 Welcome – Jeanette Longfield, Sustain: the alliance for better food and farming (Chair)

10:45 Session 1 – Trends and processes

10:45 Tom MacMillan, Food Ethics Council

Reflections on workshop 1

10:50 Dr Bill Vorley, International Institute for Environment and Development
Agrifood business: trends and processes

11:05 Questions

11:10 Discussions in small groups

11:55 Break – refreshments available

12:05 Session 2 – Successes and failures

12:05 Duncan Swift, Grant Thornton UK
The Supermarket Code – a blind eye to abusive trade practice?

12:15 Andrew George MP, Liberal Democrats
Is there a role for legislators?

12:25 Phil Evans, Consumer Association

12:35 Questions

12:40 Discussions in small groups

13:15 Lunch

14:00 Session 3 – Improving accountability

14:00 Alistair Smith, Banana Link
Mediating sustainability and accountability: a wholistic food chain approach

14:10 Nick Robins, Henderson Global Investors
Improving investor accountability in the food system

14:20 Questions

14:25 Discussions in small groups

15:10 Break – refreshments available

15:30 Final plenary

16:45 Ends

Workshop 3: civil society, 5th July

The Small Meeting House, Friends House, 173 Euston Road, London NW1 2BJ

- 10:00 Registration and refreshments**
- 10:30 Welcome – Geoff Tansey (Chair)**
- 10:45 Session 1 – Trends and processes**
- 10:45 Professor Tim Lang, City University
- 10:55 Dr Tom Wakeford, PEALS, University of Newcastle
- 11:05 Questions
- 11:10 Discussions in small groups
- 11:55 Break – refreshments available**
- 12:05 Session 2 – Priorities for change**
- 12:05 Dr Devinder Sharma
- 12:25 Questions
- 12:30 Discussions in small groups
- 13:15 Lunch**
- 14:00 Session 3 – Making change happen**
- 14:00 Warren Carter, Moulsecomb Forest Garden and Wildlife Project
- 14:10 Dr Doug Parr, Greenpeace
- 14:20 Questions
- 14:25 Discussions in small groups
- 15:10 Break – refreshments available**
- 15:30 Final plenary**
- 16:35 Closing remarks**
- 16:45 Ends**



FOOD ETHICS
COUNCIL

The Food Ethics Council
39-41 Surrey Street
Brighton
BN1 3PB

t: 0845 345 8574 (UK)
t: +44 1273 766 654 (international)
f: +44 1273 766 653

info@foodethicscouncil.org

www.foodethicscouncil.org

The Food Ethics Council is a registered charity (No. 1101885).