

Proposed Right to Food (Scotland) Bill – Rhoda Grant MSP

Summary of consultation responses

This document summarises and analyses the responses to a consultation exercise carried out on the above proposal.

The background to the proposal is set out in section 1, while section 2 gives an overview of the results. A detailed analysis of the responses to the consultation questions is given in section 3. These three sections have been prepared by the Scottish Parliament’s Non-Government Bills Unit (NGBU). Section 4 has been prepared by Rhoda Grant MSP and includes her commentary on the results of the consultation.

Where respondents have requested that certain information be treated as “not for publication,” or that the response remain anonymous, these requests have been respected in this summary.

In some places, the summary includes quantitative data about responses, including numbers and proportions of respondents who have indicated support for, or opposition to, the proposal (or particular aspects of it). In interpreting this data, it should be borne in mind that respondents are self-selecting, and it should not be assumed that their individual or collective views are representative of wider stakeholder or public opinion. The principal aim of the document is to identify the main points made by respondents, giving weight in particular to those supported by arguments and evidence and those from respondents with relevant experience and expertise. A consultation is not an opinion poll, and the best arguments may not be those that obtain majority support.

Copies of the individual responses are available on the following website [Right to Food Consultation – responses – Rhoda Grant](#). Responses have been numbered for ease of reference.

A list of respondents is set out in the Annexe.

Section 1: Introduction and background

Rhoda Grant's draft proposal, lodged on 2 September 2021, is for a bill to incorporate the human right to food into Scots law.

The proposal was accompanied by a [statement of reasons](#), stating why Rhoda Grant considered that further consultation was unnecessary (given the previous consultation carried out by Elaine Smith in the last session of the Parliament). However, the Equalities, Human Rights and Civil Justice Committee was not satisfied with the statement of reasons, which meant that, under the Parliament's rules, the proposal would fall unless a consultation document was lodged within 2 months.

A [consultation document](#) was lodged on 24 November 2021. This document, drafted with the help of the Non-Government Bills Unit, was published on the Parliament's website, from where it remains accessible.

The consultation period ran from 25 November 2021 to 16 February 2022.

Please note that this consultation summary was drafted in May 2022.

The following organisations and individuals were sent copies of the consultation document or links to it:

- All MSPs and researchers;
- Rhoda Grant's stakeholder group;
- (Former MSP) Elaine Smith's stakeholder group;
- All Scottish local authorities; and
- All Scottish Health Boards.

Rhoda Grant attended various meetings and events where she spoke about her proposed Bill, including:

- A Third Sector Circle event to update Perth and Kinross Third Sector;
- A visit to a Foodshare;
- Rhoda attended an online meeting of Co-op Party Members;
- An online meeting of the Aberdeen Trade Union Council;
- Rhoda attended an online meeting arranged by Nourish Scotland and the Scottish Food Coalition;
- A meeting with Tommy Reid from the Eat Up charity; and
- A public online meeting with Ian Byrne MP, Sarah Woolley of the Bakers Food and Allied Workers Union.

In addition, the proposal and consultation were promoted on various media outlets including:

- A press release when the consultation was launched;
- A short video which was uploaded to the Scottish Parliament website;
- Through social media (Twitter, Facebook) and on Rhoda's website;

- Promotion in various print media including local print media; and *Holyrood* magazine.

The consultation exercise was run by Rhoda Grant's parliamentary office.

The consultation process is part of the procedure that MSPs must follow in order to obtain the right to introduce a Member's bill. Further information about the procedure can be found in the Parliament's standing orders (see Rule 9.14) and in the *Guidance on Public Bills*, both of which are available on the Parliament's website:

- Standing orders (Chapter 9): [Standing Orders | Scottish Parliament Website](#)
- Guidance (Part 3): [Part 3: Stages of Bills – special cases | Scottish Parliament Website](#)

Section 2: Overview of responses

In total, 116 responses were received. Of those, 107 were received via Smart Survey, and nine by other means (such as email) The responses can be further broken down as follows:

- Four (3%) from public sector bodies [local authorities and an NHS Board];
- One (1%) from a commercial organisation (Scottish Fruit Trees);
- Three (3%) from representative organisations (Unite the Union Scotland, Bakers and Food Allied Workers Union and Scottish Care)
- 15 (13%) from third sector organisations (charitable, campaigning, social enterprise, voluntary, non- profit organisations);
- Four (3%) from other organisations (including groups of individuals, local groups);
- Five (4%) from individual politicians (MSPs, councillors);
- Nine (8%) from professionals with experience in a relevant subject;
- Three (3%) from academics with experience in a relevant subject; and
- 72 (62%) from private individuals (members of the public).

Of those responses:

- 24 (21%) were anonymous submissions;
- Six (5%) of submissions were “not for publication”.

The vast majority (98%) of respondents were supportive of the proposal to incorporate the right to food into Scots law. This support was expressed by both individuals and organisations. None of the respondents were opposed to the proposed Bill.

It was also agreed by a large majority (95%) that an independent statutory body should be given responsibility for overseeing and reporting on progress towards realising the right to food. There was also strong support for a new statutory body to be set up (72%), whilst a very small minority (3%) favoured an existing body. The remaining 25% considered that either option would be suitable.

Throughout the responses, concern was expressed as to what was viewed by many as a deepening food crisis that has been exacerbated by the Covid-19 pandemic and rising living costs. It was considered that current methods aimed at alleviating food poverty and food insecurity are not having the desired effect. While it was hoped that the proposed Bill will help to rectify this, many respondents emphasised the need to ensure that any work undertaken takes a holistic approach in order to ensure a sustainable food system is established and maintained.

Where responses have not answered the individual survey questions but instead indicated in other ways whether or not they supported the general

aims of the proposed Bill, they have been included in the overall total of responses received to the consultation but have not been included in the statistics or in the summary of individual questions.

In a few cases, more than one respondent has given the same, or a very similar, response to a question. Where such responses have been quoted in the summary, all respondents who have answered in this way will be listed in a footnote.

Section 3: Responses to consultation questions

This section sets out an overview of responses to each question in the consultation document.

Aim and approach of the proposed bill

Section 1 of the consultation document outlined the aim of the proposed Bill and what it would involve. Respondents were asked:

Question 1: Which of the following best expresses your view of the proposal to incorporate the right to food into Scots law? (Fully supportive / Partially supportive / Neutral / Partially opposed / Fully opposed / Unsure)? Please explain the reasons for your response.

One hundred and twelve respondents¹ (97% of the total) answered this question. Other responses may have indicated in other ways whether or not they supported the general aims of the Bill, but these have not been included in the following analysis.

The vast majority of respondents supported the proposed Bill. 108 (96%) were fully supportive and two (2%) were partially supportive. There were no opposed responses, with one (1%) neutral towards the proposal and one (1%) unsure.

Reasons for supporting the proposed Bill

Food as a basic need and right

Many respondents were of the view that food is a basic human need and that people have the fundamental right to be free from hunger. It was noted, however, that many people in Scotland continue to go hungry. An individual respondent, David Blair, stated:

“Along with water, shelter and warmth, food is the most basic building block of self-sufficiency and self-determination. Children struggle to learn and adults struggle to work on empty stomachs. Poor quality foods lead to health problems down the line, which stretch our already

¹ Four respondents (who submitted their response by email) did not answer the consultation questions directly. They have therefore not been included in the analysis of responses for each question.

over-burdened NHS. And unsustainable global supply chains leave us dependent on environmentally destructive practices and vulnerable to major shocks in the system. Food is sufficiently important that it deserves its own statutory commission to ensure joined-up policy making at all levels of Scottish society. The need for food security is urgent, and this right should be enshrined in Scots law now, not at an unspecified point in the future when further Human Rights legislation may or may not be introduced.” (Response 15, SS ID:181828310)

Some respondents considered Scotland to be a wealthy nation and therefore felt that people living here should always be able to easily access sufficient food. It was noted that the right to food already exists in international human rights legislation, with hope expressed that incorporating the right into Scots law would ensure that that right is fully exercised. (The Scottish Co-operative Party, Response 96, SS ID 185144861). Reference was also made to the UN Sustainable Development Goals, particularly goal 2 which aims for zero hunger by 2030. (Jean-Roger Tshilumba Kaseki, response 31, SS ID: 183228137)

The need to tackle poverty

Many respondents discussed the links between poverty and the inability to access adequate food. Some were of the view that increasing living costs are driving more people into poverty and thus increasing the need for the proposed Bill. Jordon Anderson set out some of the difficult choices that are faced by many and suggested how the proposed Bill could alleviate this situation:

“It’s very hard to balance the general cost of living, and food. So, your often made to decide between heating your home or feeding yourself. This bill cannot just focus on the right to food. It also needs to work on breaking down barriers to accessing food banks and stigma of doing so. Aside from this the bill needs to have a clear link to poverty. The right to food is not just about accessibility of food banks, it’s about the food children are given at school, the financial assistance families are given etc. I support this Bill because we need to reshape the culture of food accessibility in Scotland and encourage young people to speak up if they need help with food.” (Response 10, SS ID: 181399337)

An increasing reliance on food banks was viewed as concerning by many respondents. Eat Up Scotland, a charity that aims to relieve poverty through the distribution of food, set out why, in its view, the proposed Bill is required:

“As a charity we are filling a gap that policy doesn't fill. In the pandemic we were contributing 7 - 10 thousand meals a week. If there was a right to food, the charity would not be needed.... It's vital that Scotland

makes this law and that all support it to enhance lifestyles and get people past survival mode. There (is) catastrophic deprivation in Scotland....This bill will make life better for hundreds of thousands of people. It would save charities like Eat Up filling the void policy leaves. Foodbanks could close and all the food crisis in Scotland would be relieved and fixed.” (Response 65, SS ID: 184817962)

There was some discussion of the benefits of having access to nutritious food. As well as alleviating poverty, it was considered that this could improve people’s health and reduce stress, which could have positive long-term effects. One anonymous respondent stated:

“When children are well fed with nutritionally benefi[cial] food as the norm, they are healthy, happier, more able to learn and more able to socialise and develop into a responsible citizen contributing to society and less inclined to malnourishment-induced ill health - physically and mentally.” (Response 99, SS ID: 185163877)

Current legislation and policies

Some respondents considered that the systems and policies that are currently in place to try and tackle food poverty are insufficient and that new legislation is therefore required. The Chair of the Community Foodbank for Skye and Lochalsh, stated in her response:

“Successive governments have failed to implement realistic solutions to food insecurity, and the situation is getting worse. Everyone should be able to feed themselves and their dependents with healthy, nutritious food.” (Response 39, SS ID: 183811695)

One recurring view was that incorporating the right to food into Scots law would ensure that the Scottish Government gives priority to, and is accountable for, addressing food poverty and improving the food system in Scotland. NHS Ayrshire and Arran stated:

“NHS Ayrshire & Arran believes the government has a duty to make sure everyone can afford and enjoy a healthy and sustainable diet, the people producing the food have safe working conditions and receive a fair wage, and food is produced in a way that respects animals and the environment. Putting the right to food into Scots law would make it more likely that the Scottish Government prioritises wellbeing of people & environment in decisions on the food system.” (Response 38, SS ID: 183646426)

Some respondents mentioned the [Good Food Nation \(Scotland\) Bill](#), which, at the time of writing, was being considered by the Scottish Parliament. The Scottish Food Coalition (Response 97, SS ID: 185152214) and Obesity Action

Scotland suggested that the right to food should be incorporated into Scots law as part of that Bill. (Response 71, SS ID: 184892148)

Holistic approach and the food system

It was felt by many respondents that, rather than any quick fix, a holistic approach is required to address the problems of food insecurity and poverty. The view was expressed that this should involve a far reaching, cross-cutting approach that takes account of all aspects of the food system in Scotland and of wider societal problems. Dr Megan Blake, an academic with expertise in food insecurity, stated:

“Enshrining the right to food into law brings it into focus. But I would argue that this is not specifically a single solution issue solved only by addressing the poverty aspects of food insecurity. Poverty itself needs solutions that are more than just better benefits, just as food security needs more than just free food. Food security is the ability to afford food, certainly, but according to the UN and as demonstrated by my research, food insecurity is also the ability to access the food you need to live a healthy life in the place where you live (e.g., not having to live in a food desert and cope with the disadvantages that that imposes). It is also about the capability to use the food available to you. For example, by being able to cook it, to know what it is and how to cook it.” (Response 88, SS ID:185110662)

The Scottish Food Coalition also took the view that a cross-cutting approach is required, stating:

“In implementing the right to food, the government takes on an explicit duty to ensure that the food system delivers on social and environmental goals as well as economic ones. This means cross-cutting action in many areas of government from social security and taxation through to health, agriculture, industry, environment and climate change.” (Response 97, SS ID: 185152214)

The need for the proposed Bill to take account of concerns about the environment and climate change was raised by some respondents, including the Scottish Community Safety Network (Response 40, SS ID: 183954406).

Other points made

Some of the other points made in response to question one included:

- The need to ensure that people have access to culturally appropriate food (The Health and Social Care Alliance Scotland, response 59, SS ID: 184740176).
- The need to minimise food waste (Anonymous, response 64, SS ID:184819800);

- That the proposed Bill should encourage people to produce their own food (Scottish Community Safety Network, Response 40, SS ID: 183954406); and
- That the impact of Brexit was not mentioned in the context of the proposed Bill (Anonymous, Response 3, SS ID:179818685).

Question 2: Do you think legislation is required, or are there are other ways in which the bill’s aims could be achieved more effectively? Please explain the reasons for your response.

107 respondents (92% of the total) answered this question. While some considered that sufficient legislation is already in place or that there may be alternatives to legislation, most indicated that they considered legislation to be necessary.

Many respondents were of the view that food poverty is worsening in Scotland, as exemplified by the increasing pressure that is being placed upon food banks and other such charitable organisations. (For example, (David Gow, response 86, SS ID: 185113645). It was considered that the measures that are currently in place to tackle food poverty and associated problems have failed and that, as a result, legislation is required. The Scottish Co-operative Party stated:

“The current situation does not prevent hunger, food insecurity or food poverty. The pandemic has made clear a situation which has sadly existed in Scotland for many years. Access to food is not fairly distributed. Whilst some people struggle to feed their families others are able to stockpile food.” (Response 96, SS ID 185144861)

Concern was expressed that the burden of ensuring access to food falls upon charities such as foodbanks. (Carol Jardine, Response 6, SS ID 179980164). It was considered by many that introducing legislation would instead place responsibilities and duties on the Scottish Government, and that this would ensure accountability, allow progress to be monitored and for clear measurable targets to be set. Carol Mochan MSP stated:

“Legislation is absolutely required. Governments change, priorities change, and concentration can be lost. Commitments only go so far, but legislation places a legal duty on legislators not only to act, but to track and scrutinise the progress of the legislation, with input from an independent statutory oversight body, and ensure it is working appropriately to deliver for those it initially sought to support.” (Response 93, SS ID: 185135835)

A number of respondents considered that introducing legislation would demonstrate a commitment to prioritising human rights in Scotland and be the

best way to ensure that the necessary system-wide changes are made and adhered to, as one anonymous respondent stated:

“Legislation is important as only when government, business and community all work together can goals be reached. The right to food must be enshrined in legislation in order for it to become fully recognised in all sectors of society.” (Response 53, SS ID: 184565869)

Some responses set out how legislation could be used to achieve the Bill’s aims. For example, Unite the Union Scotland stated that “it is important to get the framework legislation right, so it fulfils the aim of guiding targeted legislation in the future to make it sustainable.” (Response 41, SS ID: 183367275) Others considered that the proposed Bill should be kept simple and that steps should be taken to ensure it does not single out certain groups. (For example, Anonymous, Response 49, SS ID: 184315133)

There was some suggestion of steps other than legislation that could be taken to help address food insecurity. For example, the Larder Social Enterprise stated:

“The right to food could be assisted by the Scottish Government using more of its powers to help for example drive up wages through its procurement powers, they could also help with energy costs to help address the current cost of living crisis and they could commit to funding local authorities much better than they do at the moment.” (Response 104 (Non-Smart Survey))

Other points made

Some of the other points made in response to this question included:

- Legislating for the right to food would ensure funding was put in place to achieve the proposal’s aims (Jan Barr, Response 61, SS ID: 184793116);
- Community engagement on matters relating to the proposed Bill should be carried out before any action is taken. (Scottish Community Safety Network, Response 40, SS ID:183954406);
- Legislation would ensure that breaches in public policy could be challenged in court (Dundee City Council, response 102, Non-Smart Survey);
- That the UK “has already ratified the right to food as part of the right to adequate standard of living within the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the incorporation of international human rights into domestic law is a repeated and strong recommendation of UN rights reviews.” (Quakers in Scotland, Response 50, SS ID: 184467227).

Question 3: Which of the following best expresses your view on an independent statutory body being given responsibility for overseeing and reporting on progress towards realising the right to food? (Fully supportive / Partially supportive / Neutral / Partially opposed / Fully opposed / Unsure)? Please explain the reasons for your response.

111 respondents (96% of the total) answered this question.

Of those responses:

- 91 (82%) were fully supportive;
- 13 (12%) were partially supportive;
- one (<1%) was partially opposed;
- two (2%) were fully opposed;
- four (4%) were neutral;
- none of the respondents were unsure.

Supportive

It was considered by many that giving a statutory body responsibility for overseeing the implementation of the right to food would ensure that an integrated approach is taken, in which different bodies and agencies work together to reach the same goal, and in which food poverty and insecurity are considered in a wider context. Councillor Richard McCready stated in his response:

“A statutory body would ensure a holistic approach to the food system. This would be an approach which would look at things like the food supply and distribution system including issues around food insecurity. As well as issues around low wages and poverty and also the links between poor health and lack of good nutrition.” (Response 77, SS ID: 185055826)

Many respondents stressed the importance of the statutory body being independent. It was considered that this would ensure that it would be impartial and able to hold the Scottish Government to account. Pamela Hepburn, a food pantry co-ordinator, stated:

“Having an independent statutory body means that there is no conflict of interest and the main focus will be on making sure that they provide impartial and professional advice as well as recognising that a systems wide approach is paramount to protecting everyone's right to food and

making sure that the government meets its promises.” (Response 70, SS ID: 184875958)

Some respondents considered it to be important that the statutory body can monitor the progress towards achieving the right to food, with Katie Morris, an academic undertaking a PhD on the right to food in the UK, noting the lack of data on food insecurity that is currently available (Response 19, SS ID:182239600). Others discussed the need for the statutory body to have ‘teeth’ and the power to make meaningful changes and that sufficient resources would need to be in place to allow the body to be effective (For example, The Bakers Food and Allied Workers Union, Response 101, Non Smart Survey).

Several respondents stressed the need for those working for, or with, the body to come from a variety of backgrounds, with the need for those with relevant lived experience considered to be of particular importance:

“Expertise from a range of people and groups who have worked in this area will be crucial to ensure whatever is created is workable and efficient and actually helps the most vulnerable. It must include those with lived experience and third sector workers who have on the ground experience of how it all plays out in real life. Only by being independent can this be protected from being influenced politically. There is opportunities here to include people from a wide range of relevant sectors giving a broad input from experts.” (Karen Dorrat, Response 73, SS ID: 184990639)

Obesity Action Scotland, while supportive of a statutory body, questioned how it would work in conjunction with existing bodies (Response 71, SS ID: 184892148), whilst another respondent expressed concern that the proposed Bill would lead to foodbanks being disbanded at a point when they were still required (Anonymous, Response 47, SS ID:184267707).

Opposed

Those who were opposed to the establishment of a statutory body considered that the implementation of the right to food should be overseen and controlled by the Scottish Government (Jordon Anderson, Response 10, SS ID:181399337).

Neutral

Some of the points made by respondents who answered in this way were:

- That services budgets are already stretched, and sufficient resources must therefore be put in place (Anonymous, Response 1, SS ID:179774959);

- That more information and clarity on how the proposed Bill's goals would be achieved is required. (Dundee City Council, response 102, Non-Smart Survey); and
- That addressing food insecurity alone, rather than in a wider context could be a missed opportunity. (Dundee City Council, response 102, Non-Smart Survey).

Question 4: Should an independent body be given responsibility for overseeing and reporting on the right to food, do you think it should be: A newly-created body; An existing body; Either option

108 respondents (93% of the total) answered this question.

Of those responses:

- 78 (72%) considered that responsibility should be given to a newly-created body;
- three (3%) considered that it should fall to an existing body; and
- 27 (25%) that either option would be suitable.

Newly-created body

Many respondents were of the view that the creation of a new body was required to ensure that fresh thinking is applied, and that focus is placed on how best to ensure that everyone has access to food. Others expressed the view that existing bodies have been unable to eradicate food poverty and that, as result, a new body is required. Both of these points were made in the response from Govan Community Project and others²:

“The challenges facing the food system have not yet been adequately addressed by any existing body, and we have seen many of these issues worsening. Rather than adding additional responsibilities to an existing body that has an established agenda and staff already committed to delivering a specific work plan, it is necessary to establish a newly created body. This body's sole focus is on taking ‘food systems’ approach, recognising the need for joined-up policy across departments and between local and national government.” (Response 54, SS ID: 184580328)

² The text above was also used in the answer to this question in the responses from the Scottish Food Coalition and an anonymous respondent.

Some respondents were of the view that there are not any appropriate existing bodies that would be able to take on the role envisioned. (For example, Anonymous, Response 13, SS ID: 181602500) It was considered that creating a new body would mean that conflicts of interest were avoided and ensure impartiality. (Iain Gregory, response 11, SS ID: 181515042)

Food Train indicated that issues within the food system as a whole need to be addressed in the work undertaken by the statutory body:

“A Food Commission would take responsibility for all food issues in Scotland (that are cross cutting and spread across different portfolios). As an organisation working in relation to public health, we recognise the importance of systematic, cross-sectoral work and the need for joined up policy making to improve not just health but also social, economic, and environmental outcomes. Food should be seen as the glue and having a body with the sole purpose of progressing food issues is a central step to prioritising and progressing this.” (Food Train, Response 106, Non- Smart Survey)

Other respondents also shared their views on what form a new body should take and on how it should function, with the Govan Community Project and others stating³:

“Rather than adding additional responsibilities to an existing body that has an established agenda and staff already committed to delivering a specific work plan, it is necessary to establish a newly created body. This body's sole focus is on taking ‘food systems’ approach, recognising the need for joined-up policy across departments and between local and national government. This body could:

- Undertake research and make recommendations
- Report on the state of Scotland’s food system and progress made on realising the right to food
- Facilitate and support partnership working to drive food systems change
- Enable people across Scotland to input into plans that will shape their food system” (Response 54, SS ID: 184580328).

Aberdeen City Council considered that the creation of a new body would indicate Scotland’s commitment to addressing food insecurity (Response 74, SS ID: 184993265).

Existing body

³ The following text was also used in the answer to this question in the response from an anonymous respondent. In addition, part of the text was used in the response to this question from the Scottish Food Coalition.

As noted above, only three respondents took the view that an existing body should be given responsibility for overseeing and reporting on the right to food. NHS Ayrshire and Arran raised concerns about the creation of a new body and how this would fit in with what is already in place:

“NHS Ayrshire & Arran hold concerns around another statutory body being established; adding to the currently complex landscape, the cost to set-up, new links needing to be forged, and the need to be well resourced. An existing body such as Food Standards Scotland will require to be given additional powers to deliver the ambitious actions being set out for whole-system change.” (Response 38, SS ID: 183646426)

One respondent suggested that an existing body, such as the Scottish Human Rights Commission, would allow “the influence and impact of existing structures to be maximised.” (Dundee City Council, Response 102, Non-Smart Survey)

Either option

A number of respondents considered that either option may be suitable. Comments made by respondents who answered in this way included:

- If an existing body has been proven to be effective in its current work, it should also be given responsibility for overseeing the right to food. (Marion McPherson, Response 22, SS ID: 182463070);
- The creation of quangos should be avoided where possible, with an existing body therefore taking on the remit. (Anonymous, Response 48, 184305952);
- That either option would be acceptable, as long as the body is independent. (Billy Smith, Response 25, SS ID: 182666646); and
- That careful consideration of this matter should be given when the proposed Bill is drafted. (Patricia Ellison, Response 24, SS ID:182529986).

Question 5: Which of the following best expresses your view of enshrining a right to food into Scots law as a priority in advance of, and in a manner which is compatible with, any further Scottish Government legislation on wider human rights? (Fully supportive / Partially supportive / Neutral / Partially opposed / Fully opposed / Unsure)? Please explain the reasons for your response.

112 respondents (97% of the total) answered this question.

Of those responses:

- 101 (90%) were fully supportive;
- five (4.5%) were partially supportive;
- one (1%) was fully opposed;
- five (4.5%) were neutral; and
- None of the responses were unsure.

Supportive

In answering this question, many respondents took the opportunity to reiterate their support for the right to food being incorporated into Scots law. With regards to the prioritising of this over other human rights legislation, a common view was that food insecurity in Scotland requires an immediate response and therefore any delays to action should be avoided. Reference was made to the food crisis deepening as a result of both the Covid-19 pandemic and the rising cost of living.

Summarising its view on why legislating for the right to food should be prioritised, The Bakers and Food Alliance Workers Union, stated:

“To prevent hunger and food insecurity we believe the Scottish Government must commit to the right to food, beyond a wider framing of human rights law, onto a statutory footing and make it the law of the land. When legislating for it the Scottish Government must develop approaches and policies that mean people do not go hungry or feel insecure about where food and their next meal is coming from.

This means lifting incomes using existing powers to do so but it also means ensuring people are given basic supplies of food that ensures their basic food needs are met, legislating around the distribution of waste food and obliges the responsibility on the state to ensure no-one goes hungry.” (Response 101, non-Smart Survey response)

It was considered by a number of respondents that the steps currently being taken to address food poverty and food insecurity are not effective and that enshrining the right to food into Scots law should therefore be prioritised. Many respondents expressed their support for the Scottish Government’s plans to introduce wider human rights legislation but noted that there was no set timetable for such legislation being brought forward. In its response the Scottish Co-operative Party stated:

“The Scottish Government has indicated that it may legislate in this area over a number of years and still there is no clear timescale for Scottish Government legislation. As has been highlighted the situation in 2022 where people are going hungry calls out for action now and not at some indeterminate point in the future. There is a need to legislate on the Right to Food now.” (Response 96, SS ID: 185144861)

Some respondents, while supportive of the prioritisation of incorporating the right to food into Scots law, noted that it should be compatible with other human rights legislation, and with other food-based rights, as far as possible:

“The respecting of rights and integration of food-based rights with wider rights commitments is of critical importance, and must become standard practice across the food system. As CFINE has previously commented, the right to food must be brought forward as soon as possible to ensure this and, where this is compatible with other food-systems consultations, alignment between them must be ensured. As a rights-based piece of legislation, and one key element of longer-term governmental rights-based commitments, it is essential that this is prioritised.” (CFINE, Response 90, SS ID: 185128668)

Some suggestions were made as to alternative means of incorporating the right to food into Scots law, for example, through including it in the Good Food Nation (Scotland) Bill (for example by Abundant Borders, Response 72, SS ID: 184900099). Others, such as Granite City Good Food, made reference to the United Nation Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC), stating that “the ambition of the right to food must match that of the scale of similar rights-based legislation, such as which occurs in discussion around the UNCRC, through which consensus is evident and a transformative approach was committed to.” (Response 92, SS ID:185141531).

NHS Ayrshire and Arran, while supportive of prioritising incorporating the right to food into Scots law, noted that the Scottish Government does not have the power to make changes to the benefits system which could help alleviate poverty. Further to this, it stressed that the proposed Bill should encompass the whole food system rather than focusing solely on food insecurity. (Response 38, SS ID: 183646426).

Opposed

Dundee City Council (the only respondent opposed) considered that food insecurity should be addressed alongside other inequalities to allow for a more holistic approach to be taken. (Response 102, Non-Smart Survey).

Neutral

Points made by the five respondents who chose this option included:

- That the respondent could not determine whether food insecurity was the ‘largest’ issue and should therefore be given priority. (Aberdeen City Council, Response 74, SS 184993265); and
- That whichever method which would implement the right to food as quickly as possible should be used. (Anonymous, Response 99, SS ID: 185163877).

Question 6: Which of the following best expresses your view of placing responsibility for guaranteeing the right to food on the Scottish Government? (Fully supportive / Partially supportive / Neutral / Partially opposed / Fully opposed / Unsure)? Please explain the reasons for your response.

111 respondents (96% of the total) answered this question.

Of those responses:

- 90 (81%) were fully supportive;
- 15 (14%) were partially supportive;
- one (<1%) was partially opposed;
- one (<1%) was fully opposed;
- three (3%) respondents were neutral; and
- one (<1%) was unsure.

Supportive

Many respondents answered this question by stating that the Scottish Government has overall responsibility for the welfare of its citizens. Of those that expanded on this view, many considered that giving the Government responsibility for guaranteeing the right to food would ensure that the matter is given the significance it requires, and that adequate funding would be put in place. Pamela Hepburn stated:

“This will mean that ultimately the Government has to address the growing levels of food insecurity. For too long now charities, food banks etc have had to take up the position of helping people in need, this has to be addressed in a modern society as no one should be without access to feed themselves or their family. It will also mean that the Government has to address the poor wages and job security for the catering industry, animal welfare and the environment. If we want to improve the overall standards, then the Government must be accountable for the health, wellbeing and environmental impact for Scotland.” (Response 70, SS ID: 184875958)

An individual respondent, David Brown, felt that the Scottish Government would be best placed to have oversight of the guaranteeing of the right to food and will be able to “assess and co-ordinate the roles of the charitable, local government and other sectors to achieve effective outcomes.” (Response 78, SS ID: 185058770)

Other respondents acknowledged the ongoing work being carried out by food banks and other third sector organisations but considered that problems such as food poverty would only be resolved if co-ordinated, larger-scale actions

are taken by the Scottish Government and if the root causes of such issues were addressed. Claire McCready stated:

“Support is piecemeal across the country, and often it is not proportionate to the level of need in a specific area. There needs to be a national framework, with the same right to food on offer to everyone, no matter where they live in Scotland, thus this responsibility must sit with the Scottish Government.” (Response 91, SS ID:185129816)

Some respondents were of the view that responsibility for guaranteeing the right to food should not fall solely on the Scottish Government. It was suggested that some responsibility should fall to individuals (Robert Gilhooley, Response 80, SS ID:185062328), the private sector (The Scotcoin Project CIC, Response 42, SS ID:184002313) and with UK and local government (Jean-Roger Tshilumba Kaseki, Response 31, SS ID: 183228137).

Some respondents stressed the importance of different stakeholders work together, with The Health and Social Care Alliance Scotland stating:

“The ALLIANCE supports placing primary responsibility for guaranteeing the right to food on the Scottish Government. However, local authorities and Health and Social Care Partnerships should also share that responsibility, as they are likely to be heavily involved in the practical delivery of efforts therein – and should, in turn, be accountable to the people accessing services.

As part of that responsibility, is vital that plans and policies are co-produced with people with lived experience – and particularly people with lived experience of food poverty or for whom access to food is difficult. Done properly, co-production takes time, and involved investment in people to support their input. Such systems bring significant benefits and expertise, that would deliver better policy and plans – but they would require engagement from local authorities and Health and Social Care Partnerships, as well as Ministers” (Response 59, SS ID: 184740176)

Some concerns were raised by those who were partially supportive, including on how guaranteeing the right to food would be funded (Anonymous, Response 17, SS ID: 181969295) and on how the Scottish Government could be challenged should the right to food not be realised (Scottish Community Safety Network, Response 40, SS ID: 183954406). One respondent, David Blair questioned whether placing responsibility on the Scottish Government may have a negative effect on the role played by local authorities and communities:

“I am fully supportive of the ultimate responsibility lying with ScotGov. My only concern is if this leads to more centralising tendencies, with further power eroded from local authorities and communities. ScotGov should have ultimate responsibility, but must act in a way that properly

empowers and resources LAs and communities.” (Response 15, SS ID:181828310)

Opposed

The two respondents who were opposed raised concerns as to whether the Scottish Government was best placed to have responsibility for guaranteeing the right to food.

Covid-19 pandemic

Question 7: What impact do you consider the effects of, and response to, the Covid-19 pandemic has had on the need for a right to food to be incorporated into Scots law? (Increased the need for a Bill/Decreased the need for a Bill/No significant impact/Unsure)

112 respondents (97% of the total) answered this question.

Of those responses:

- 96 (86%) considered that the Covid-19 pandemic had increased the need for a bill;
- 10 (9%) considered that it had no significant impact;
- None of the respondents considered that the pandemic had decreased the need for a bill; and
- 6 (5%) were unsure.

Increased the need for a Bill

It was considered by the vast majority of respondents that the Covid-19 pandemic has highlighted the inequalities in society, with people who were already facing food insecurities being further adversely affected. One anonymous respondent stated:

“The Covid 19 pandemic has worsened the disparity between rich and poor - widening wealth disparities and revealing even more than before the vulnerabilities and non-sustainable elements in our food systems.”
(Response 53, SS ID:184565869)

It was noted that many people had lost their jobs or businesses during the pandemic, or that their incomes had decreased, resulting in more people being pushed into poverty. Many respondents expressed concern about the increased reliance on food banks because of the pandemic, with some also

referencing the ongoing increased cost of living crisis. One respondent, Kate Ramsden, stated:

“Covid has both increased the numbers of people dependent on food banks as a result of food insecurity and has also exposed the levels of hunger within Scotland. Combined with increasing costs of food and especially fuel, loss of employment and growing ill-health including mental ill health, this is a perfect storm and it needs to be addressed as a matter of urgency.” (Response 23, SS ID: 182469900)

The Trussell Trust stated that the Covid-19 pandemic had “exposed the vulnerability of the UK’s food system to shocks and worsened many existing challenges.” (Response 89, SS ID: 184750777) In its response, the Scottish Food Coalition discussed issues with the food system as a whole in the context of the pandemic⁴:

“The pandemic has exacerbated some of the challenges that have long plagued the food system. Long and complex supply chains have weakened Scotland’s resilience and left the country vulnerable to disruptions in global supply. Scotland is dependent on imports such as fertiliser and animal feeds. In the meantime, producing food for export has been given precedence over producing food to eat. Local food chains are limited. Jobs in this sector remain amongst the least well paid and the most precarious.

The COVID-19 pandemic has exposed the vulnerability of these individuals - and the families who depend on their wages - with hundreds of thousands facing job losses, low levels of statutory sick pay and unfair compensation. Relatedly, there has been a significant rise in demand for food banks. Poor diet, and dietary inequalities, are a major cause of ill health in Scotland. Obesity has been found to be a risk factor in COVID-19 severity and outcomes - there is an increased need to address the unhealthy food environment we currently live in.” (Response 97, SS ID: 185152214)

Obesity Action Scotland and others noted that the pandemic had underlined the importance of a healthy diet in order to build a resilience against disease and ill-health in the population. Its response noted, for example, that being overweight or obese was a risk factor for Covid-19 and that it considered that many people’s diets had worsened during the pandemic. Further to this, it noted that the “pandemic has also further exacerbated existing inequalities in diet and unhealthy weight in the population, with those in lower socioeconomic groups experiencing worse outcomes.” (Response 71, SS ID: 184892148)

Some responses focussed on the impact that the pandemic has had on certain groups of people. For example, Scottish Care spoke about the

⁴ The following text was also used in the answer to this question in the response from the Govan Community Project.

disproportionate affect that Covid-19 has had on older people. It explained that lockdowns and the need to isolate has led to older people becoming “more sedentary and frailer, losing mobility and socialisation, and as a result even more isolated and cut off than they were before.” (Scottish Care, Response 69, SS ID: 184614998). This, combined with frontline services becoming stretched and often suspended or withdrawn during the pandemic was said to have had a negative impact on older people, as has changes which Scottish Care notes are increasingly being made to care packages. It states that:

“Frontline social care staff have a critical role in enabling individuals to remain independent and well in their own homes. This cannot be achieved by an emphasis on social care practice which strips out the ability to have flexibility and to build relationships with those being supported. This lack of priority around the relational dimension of social care is perhaps especially evident in its impact on the right of individuals to exercise their human right to food, which we believe struggles to be delivered when a carer is forced to heat up a microwaveable food package and because of time constraints cannot then sit and be with the supported person as they eat that meal of sometimes questionable nutritional benefit. The right to food is daily being diminished by current social care practice and has undoubtedly become worsened by the pandemic.” (Scottish Care, Response 69, SS ID: 184614998)

No significant impact

Of those who answered in this way and offered further comment, the prevailing view expressed was that problems in the food system already existed prior to the Covid-19 pandemic. It was considered by some that the pandemic had highlighted such issues but had not in itself created them.

Financial implications

Question 8: Taking into account all those likely to be affected (including public sector bodies, businesses and individuals etc), is the proposed Bill likely to lead to: a significant increase in costs / some increase in costs / no overall change in costs / some reduction in costs / a significant reduction in costs / don't know. Please indicate where you would expect the impact identified to fall (including public sector bodies, businesses and individuals etc). You may also wish to suggest ways in which the aims of the Bill could be delivered more cost-effectively.

112 respondents (97% of the total) answered this question.

Of those respondents:

- 13 (12%) considered that there would be a significant increase in costs;
- 44 (39%) considered that there would be some increase in costs;
- 28 (25%) considered that there would no overall changes in costs;
- one (<1%) considered that there would some reduction in costs;
- three (3%) considered that there would be a significant reduction in costs; and
- 23 (20.5%) did not know what the impact on costs would be.

Increase in costs

Many respondents expressed the view that the proposed Bill would create some costs for the Scottish Government and public sector organisations, for example in setting up an independent statutory body. (For example, The Scotcoin Project CIC, Response 42, SS ID:184002313). It was further suggested that local authorities and health boards may have to allocate resources to implementing the right to food. (The Health and Social Care Alliance Scotland, Response 59, SS ID: 184740176).

It was also considered that businesses would face increased costs, for example, when paying higher wages so that staff can afford to buy nutritious food. (for example, the Scottish Food Coalition, Response 97, SS ID: 185152214). Many respondents considered, however, that any such investment would be worth it due to the benefits of having a healthy population. It was felt that this would in turn lead to less burden being placed on the NHS (for example, Pamela Hepburn, Response 70, SS ID: 184875958). The Food Train gave an example of the health and social care costs being three times higher for a malnourished patient than for a non-malnourished patient. (Response 106, Non-Smart Survey). In addition, it was considered that an investment by businesses in reducing food waste may lead to long-term savings for businesses. (for example, The Scotcoin Project CIC, Response 42, SS ID:184002313).

It was considered that individuals could experience a reduction in costs as a result of the proposed Bill, with the Scottish Food Coalition stating⁵:

“Putting the right to food into law will place the responsibility on the Government to ensure everyone can afford nutritious food, for example, through fair wages or adequate benefits. Though this is not about making food cheaper; it is about making sure everyone in Scotland can access healthy food with dignity. So, individuals and

⁵ The following text was also used in the answer to this question in the response from the Govan Community Project.

families would see a reduction in their costs relative to their income.”
(Response 97, SS ID: 185152214)

No overall change in costs

The general view expressed by those who answered in this way, and as already discussed elsewhere, was that there would be initial costs as a result of the proposals in the Bill being implemented, but that these would constitute an investment that would lead to savings in the long-term. Respondents discussed the benefits of a better-fed, healthier population. It was considered, for example, that there would be less pressure on the NHS and businesses would benefit from healthier employees who required fewer sick days (Oliver Goulden, Response 27, SS ID:183044168) It was also suggested that educational attainment could improve. (Billy Halliday, Response 32, SS ID: 183232601).

Other benefits referenced were the potential for more home-grown, locally produced food to be used, leading to increased sustainability (Jan Barr, Response 61, SS ID: 184793116) It was also suggested that the proposal would lead to sectors having to co-ordinate their actions, with efficiency gains made as a result (David Brown, Response 78, SS ID:185058770).

Reduction in costs

Only four respondents thought there would be a reduction in costs. Suggestions made by respondents who answered in this way included:

- Businesses would make savings due to a reduction in food waste (Lee McGonigle, Response 43, SS ID: 184063576);
- The agricultural sector would benefit from more emphasis being placed on the use of locally-grown food (Anonymous, Response 53, SS ID:184565869);
- Individual food bills would be reduced (Jamie Tiong, Response 46, SS ID: 184145393); and
- Increased public health would reduce long-term healthcare costs (David Blair, Response 15, SS ID:181828310)

Don't Know

Further comments by respondents who answered in this way included:

- That there is insufficient information available on potential costs for the respondent to reach a conclusion (Marion McPherson, Response 22, SS ID: 182463070)
- That a cost-benefit analysis of investing in healthy food and food systems should be carried out (Obesity Action Scotland, Response 71, SS ID: 184892148)

- There is likely to be an increase in costs for the public sector, due to changes in supply chains and procurement practices (Obesity Action Scotland, Response 71, SS ID: 184892148)
- Implementing the proposed Bill would be a long-term investment that could lead to positive changes such as less burden being placed on the NHS, and fewer sick days being taken (Abundant Borders, Response 72, SS ID: 184900099)
- Waste land could be cleared and made fit to grow fresh organic produce. (Anonymous, Response 7, SS ID: 180302136)

Equalities

Question 9: What overall impact is the proposed Bill likely to have on equality, taking account of the following protected characteristics (under the Equality Act 2010): age, disability, gender re-assignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation? (Positive / Slightly positive / Neutral (neither positive nor negative) / Slightly negative / Negative / Unsure). Please explain the reasons for your response. Where any negative impacts are identified, you may also wish to suggest ways in which these could be minimised or avoided.

112 respondents (97% of the total) answered this question.

Of those respondents:

- 81 (72%) considered the proposed Bill would have a positive impact on equalities;
- 11 (10%) considered that it would have a slightly positive impact;
- One (1%) considered that it would negative impact;
- One (1%) considered that it would have a slightly negative impact;
- 10 (9%) considered that the impact would be neutral; and
- Eight (7%) respondents were unsure of what the impact would be.

Of the respondents who thought that there would be a negative or neutral impact, or were unsure, the prevailing view expressed was that the proposed bill should affect everyone equally, regardless of whether they have a protected characteristic.

Positive impact

Whilst some respondents considered that the proposed Bill would help everyone in the same way, most considered that food poverty and its associated issues disproportionately effect people with protected characteristics and that, as a result, the Bill's provisions would particularly benefit these people. Kate Ramsden states in her response:

“We know that food insecurity disproportionately affects the poorest in our society and particularly those with protected characteristics, such as women, children, older people and those with disabilities. Also many Black and minority ethnic workers, women and young people tend to be in low paid, insecure work. Other equalities groups are also disproportionately impacted. So creating a legal right to food would promote equality for these groups if they no longer had the additional challenge of food insecurity.” (Response 23, SS ID: 182469900)

Many of the responses discussed the specific challenges facing those with protected characteristics. For example, it was suggested that disabled people or certain ethnic minority groups are more likely to experience food poverty (Councillor Richard McCready, Response 77, SS ID: 185055826)

Thoughts were expressed as to how the proposed Bill should be implemented in such a way that would have a positive impact on equalities. For example, respondents considered it important that those with lived experience of food poverty play a role in ensuring that the Bill's aims are implemented. Obesity Action Scotland stated:

“With regards to the independent statutory body, it is important that its representation takes account of the protected characteristics, such as age, disability, gender, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race and ethnicity, religion or belief, sexual orientation. Promoting equality and ensuring everyone is represented and has their voices heard is at the heart of the right to food and so it must be key to any decisions about our food system.” (Response 71, SS ID: 184892148)

Aberdeen City Council considered that the “right to food will ensure that e.g. religious, health related dietary requirements can be adequately met.” (Response 74, SS ID:184993265) Respondents such as CFINE (Response 90 SS ID: 185128668) and Granite City Good Food (Response 92, SS ID:185141531) noted the stigma that can be associated with food inequality and the hope that the implementation of the right to food for all would reduce, or eradicate, the stigma associated with accessing food support.

It was acknowledged that the potential impact on equalities should be assessed and monitored as the proposed Bill is developed, with Dundee City Council (Response 102, Non-Smart Survey) and the Food Train (Response 106, Non-Smart Survey) suggesting that equalities impact assessments are carried out.

Sustainability

Question 10: In terms of assessing the proposed Bill's potential impact on sustainable development, you may wish to consider how it relates to the following principles:

- **living within environmental limits**
- **ensuring a strong, healthy and just society**
- **achieving a sustainable economy**
- **promoting effective, participative systems of governance**
- **ensuring policy is developed on the basis of strong scientific evidence.**

With these principles in mind, do you consider that the bill can be delivered sustainably? (yes / no / unsure). Please explain the reasons for your response.

112 respondents answered this question (97% of the total).

Of those respondents:

- 100 (89%) considered that the proposed Bill could be delivered sustainably;
- One (1%) did not consider that the Bill could be delivered sustainably (no explanation was provided); and
- 11 (10%) were unsure.

The one respondent who did not consider that the Bill could be delivered sustainably did not leave further comment.

Yes – the Bill can be delivered sustainably

Many respondents focused their remarks on the first three categories listed above – living within environmental limits, ensuring a strong, healthy and just

society and achieving a sustainable economy. Govan Community Project among others⁶ noted the links between these three factors:

“Making farming and fishing less wasteful and less polluting will have a positive environmental impact. Improving wages and social security so that individuals and families can afford a healthy diet will have a positive social impact. And improving business employment practices may come at an initial cost increase, but the benefit of job retention, a healthier workforce, and better public perception of those businesses should have a long term positive economic impact. This Bill's proposal to establish a body to oversee the food system could enable people across Scotland to input into plans that will shape their food system and ensure that policy is developed on the basis of evidence.”
(Response 54, SS ID: 184580328)

With regards to the environment, respondents pointed out the benefits of creating a sustainable food system in which waste is substantially reduced and the use of locally sourced food is prioritised. Unite the Union Scotland referenced the impact that food production has on the environment in its response:

“Our current food production system contributes to around 30% of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions caused by human activity. It is the leading cause of deforestation, land-use change and biodiversity loss, accounts for 70% of human water use, and is a major source of water pollution. Public procurement of sustainable food is one of the most effective mechanisms at our disposal to drive transformation in food production and supply.” (Response 41, SS ID: 183367275)

Suggestions were made as to how to most effectively use locally-sourced food, for example, through the use of community or in encouraging people to grow their own food (CFINE, Response 90 SS ID: 185128668). The Scottish Community Safety Network was of the view that any work undertaken on the proposed Bill “needs [collaboration] with key departments, charities and organisations across Scotland that for work exclusively in sustainable food production and the circular economy and are forward thinking in this area.” (Response 40, SS ID: 183954406).

Some respondents considered that the proposed Bill could have a positive impact on people's health and wellbeing, and that as a result there would be less pressure on health and social services. (Kate Ramsden, Response 23, SS ID: 182469900).

⁶ The following text (or almost identical text) was also used in the answer to this question in the responses from the Scottish Food Coalition and an anonymous respondent.

General

Question 11: Do you have any other additional comments or suggestions on the proposed bill (which have not already been covered in any of your responses to earlier questions)?

63 respondents (54% of the total) answered this question.

The majority of respondents who answered this question reiterated their support for the proposal and stressed the need to take steps to end food poverty and food insecurity. Some of the other comments made include:

- Supermarkets should be fined for wasting food (Anonymous, Response 7, SS ID:180302136);
- Family centres could be set up in communities to help families learn about food, nutrition and cooking (Maureen Macmillan, Response 57, SS ID:184668210);
- The right to food should include access to food for asylum seekers and refugees (Kate Ramsden, Response 23, SS ID: 182469900);
- Legislating for the right to food would show Scotland to be a progressive and inclusive society (William Jackson, Response 29, SS ID:183156771);
- Consideration should be given to supporting the Scottish Government's work on ending the need for food banks should be supported, in order to avoid duplication of work (Chair of the Community Foodbank, Response 39, SS ID: 183811695);
- That the Sustainable Development Goal 2 of 'Zero Hunger by 2030' applies in Scotland (Councillor Richard McCready, Response 77, SS ID: 185055826);
- Those on the 'frontline' must be consulted before any response. (Dr Megan Blake, Response 88, SS ID:185110662);
- Those who work in the Scottish Food Drink and Agriculture industry face several challenges as they are more likely to be low paid, in more precarious contracts and subject to forced labour. (Unite the Union Scotland, Response 41, SS ID: 183367275);
- That a lack of regulation and appropriate employment law combined with the effects of Covid-19 and Brexit had made things worse for people working in the sector. (Unite the Union Scotland, Response 41, SS ID: 183367275);
- The proposed Bill should provide for robust targets which are "important for coordinating activities across different policy areas and for clearly outlining a direction of travel." (Obesity Action Scotland, Response 71, SS ID: 184892148) Some suggested targets were set out in Obesity Action Scotland's response.

Section 4: Member's Commentary

Rhoda Grant MSP has provided the following commentary on the results of the consultation, as summarised in sections 1-3 above.

I want to thank everyone who took the time to respond to the consultation. I also want to thank former MSP Elaine Smith for her work on this issue in the last parliament.

I appreciate that those who responded gave up their own time to do so. Some from organisations that have staff resources but many from organisations whose resources are used to combat hunger and have little time to fill in questionnaires. I know responding to consultations is time consuming and may have been frustrating for those who already responded to my colleague Elaine Smith MSP's consultation. I also want to thank the individuals who responded, sharing their knowledge and insight.

I was struck by the testimonies of those who responded who understood the impact of hunger and malnutrition on all aspects of our lives, from our health to our ability to learn and contribute to society. It was also clear that the pandemic had made the situation worse, and indeed some of those I spoke to were clearly frustrated at the time it would take to put this legislation through when people were suffering from hunger and malnutrition now. The cost-of-living crisis continues to exacerbate this situation: now more than ever we need to make the human right to food a reality.

It is clear to me that the vast majority of those who responded to both Elaine's consultation and mine were supportive of the proposed Bill and of a Commission to oversee our progress toward eliminating hunger and making our right to food a reality. Since my consultation concluded, the Parliament has passed the Good Food Nation (Scotland) Act. One of the provisions of this Act is for the Scottish Government to establish a Scottish Food Commission, albeit with fewer powers than envisioned in my proposal. During the passage of that Act I sought, through proposed amendments to the bill, to have the aims of this Proposal included in the Good Food Nation (Scotland) Act. These were unsuccessful and on that basis extending the powers of the Scottish Food Commission to include the powers set out in my proposal is something that I will now seek to achieve with my Bill, alongside its other provisions.

It was also recognized in responses that, as the Bill could lead to higher costs in the short term but lower costs going forward, it would be a "spend to save" policy. This investment in people and communities would bring better life outcomes for many and I believe that we should proceed to make this a reality.



Rhoda Grant MSP

February 2024

Annexe

Response number	Smart Survey ID	Name of organization/individual
1	179774959	Anonymous
2	179804223	James McCarthy
3	179818685	Anonymous
4	179862669	Anonymous
5	179873885	Philip Michael Watson
6	179980164	Carol Jardine
7	180302136	Anonymous
8	180304417	Catriona Wright
9	180449841	Bryan Morgan
10	181399337	Jordon Anderson
11	181515042	Iain Gregory
12	181581595	Anonymous
13	181602500	Anonymous
14	181828422	Anonymous
15	181828310	David Blair
16	181867212	Scottish Fruit Trees
17	181969295	Anonymous
18	182081372	Anonymous
19	182239600	Katie Morris
20	182343796	Anonymous
21	182414631	Anonymous
22	182463070	Marion McPherson
23	182469900	Kate Ramsden
24	182529986	Patricia Ellison
25	182666646	Billy Smith
26	182799299	Anonymous
27	183044168	Oliver Goulden
28	183147705	Rob Burney
29	183156771	William Jackson
30	183157369	Anonymous
31	183228137	Jean-Roger Tshilumba Kaseki
32	183232601	Billy Halliday
33	183234767	Anonymous
34	183236297	Mandy McIntosh
35	183420574	Martin Meteyard
36	183439671	Gordon Graham
37	183448775	George Tookey
38	183646426	NHS Ayrshire & Arran
39	183811695	Chair of The Community Foodbank
40	183954406	Scottish Community Safety Network
41	183367275	Unite the Union Scotland
42	184002313	The Scotcoin Project CIC

Response number	Smart Survey ID	Name of organization/individual
43	184063576	Lee McGonigle
44	184072625	Anonymous
45	184115962	David Shannon
46	184145393	Jamie Tiong
47	184267707	Anonymous
48	184305952	Anonymous
49	184315133	Anonymous
50	184467227	Quakers in Scotland
51	184522709	Mrs Sharon Morgan
52	184558163	Patricia Gentry
53	184565869	Anonymous
54	184580328	Govan Community Project
55	184620826	Martin Parkes
56	184632223	Anonymous
57	184668210	Maureen MacMillan
58	184733315	Owen Wright
59	184740176	The Health and Social Care Alliance Scotland
60	184746761	Stephen Millrine
61	184793116	Jan Barr
62	184797053	Louisa Potter
63	184636961	Anonymous
64	184819800	Anonymous
65	184817962	Eat Up
66	184512130	Margaret Ghosh
67	184857768	T Fitzpatrick
68	184869206	Anonymous
69	184614998	Scottish Care
70	184875958	Pamela Hepburn
71	184892148	Obesity Action Scotland
72	184900099	Abundant Borders
73	184990639	Karen Dorrat
74	184993265	Aberdeen City Council
75	185008729	Transition Edinburgh
76	185014177	Tamara Hedderwick
77	185055826	Councillor Richard McCready
78	185058770	David Brown
79	185061394	Gary Roberts
80	185062328	Robert Gilhooly
81	185057519	Francesca Brennan
82	185073855	Peter Menellis
83	185075289	Gee Macdee
84	185080310	Councillor Kevin Keenan
85	185091427	Hugh McGivern

Response number	Smart Survey ID	Name of organization/individual
86	185113645	David Gow
87	185112847	Kenneth MacLennan
88	185110662	Dr Megan Blake
89	184750777	The Trussell Trust
90	185128668	CFINE
91	185129816	Clare McCready
92	185141531	Granite City Good Food
93	185135835	Carol Mochan MSP
94	185147779	Anonymous
95	185149672	Kevin McGregor
96	185144861	Scottish Co-operative Party
97	185152214	Scottish Food Coalition
98	185162524	Martin Nolan
99	185163877	Anonymous
100	185174253	Rita Millar
101	Non-Smart survey	The Bakers Food and Allied Workers Union (BFAWU)
102	Non-Smart survey	Dundee City Council
103	Non-Smart survey	Children and Young People's Commissioner Scotland (CYPCS)
104	Non-Smart survey	The Larder Social Enterprise
105	Non-Smart survey	Anonymous
106	Non-Smart survey	Food Train
107	Non-Smart survey	Nourish
108	Non-Smart survey	Right to Food Working Group 1
109	Non-Smart survey	Right to Food Working Group 2
110	184191345	Dawn Robertson