

FOOD EPI METHODS FOR THE RATING WORKSHOP FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

What are we scoring England's policies against?

We are scoring England's policies and infrastructure support (as documented in the Evidence Paper) against two comparators:

1. *International Examples* of policies and infrastructure support in real-life settings
2. *Good Practice Statements* which describe, as far as is known, the best possible policy and infrastructure support.

Why are we scoring with two different comparators?

The Food EPI method as applied in New Zealand and Thailand compared each policy evidence against *International Examples*. This is important in order to have results which are comparable with other countries i.e. How well is England doing compared to other countries?

We thought that it would be good to also compare evidence of policy in England against the *Good Practice Statements* (the ideal) i.e. Is England doing as well as it should? This is because in some areas *International Examples* are lacking or represent only a partial implementation of the policy area. Furthermore, the purpose of the exercise is to build consensus on areas of policy that could be improved and in some cases England may be doing better than other countries but there remains room for improvement.

How do we record the different scores?

We will record both scores on a paper form. The score against the *Good Practice Statements* will also be scored using electronic clickers.

What's the difference between *International Examples* and *Good Practice Statements*?

International Examples are policy measures which have been put in place across the world (including in England). *Good Practice Statements* are statements of ideal policy but which may not yet be found in practice in a real-life setting. In some cases, the *International Examples* will be very close to the ideal good practice. In other situations, they will be quite different.

How have the *International Examples* been decided upon?

The *International Examples* have been agreed on by the Informas Network and have in many instances been drawn from the Nourishing Framework maintained by World Cancer Research Fund International. They have been chosen to represent the best policy applications in real life settings of the *Good Practice Statements*.

How have the *Good Practice Statements* been decided upon?

These have been drafted by the Informas network and have been modified after rating workshops held in New Zealand and Thailand.

What should be taken into account in deciding the exact scoring?

Two slides of evidence relevant to each *Good Practice Statement* will be presented in advance of each rating. The first will present evidence of the situation in England. The second will present *International Examples*. The scoring will depend upon your judgment of the implementation gap based on the evidence presented.

The following factors are likely to affect your judgment:

- Scope (Does government policy fully address all aspects of the *Good Practice Statement / International Example*?)
- Compliance (Is government policy voluntarily applied or mandatory?)
- Process (Is government policy already being applied or in process?)
- Quality of evidence (Is information available or not?)

We will not be explicitly taking into account the evidence of impact of the policy where this exists but sticking to a comparison to the *International Example* or *Good Practice Statement*. Evidence of impact will come into the prioritization of the Action statements in the follow-up email consultation which will take place after the workshop.

What does implementation gap mean?

You will be asked to judge the extent of implementation by the Government of policies and infrastructure support in England on a scale of 1-5 (1=less than 20% implementation, 2=20-40% implementation, 3=40-60% implementation, 4=60-80% implementation, 5=80-100% implementation). An option of 'cannot rate'= 6 is included for those who feel they lack sufficient evidence to come to a decision.

What if we disagree with the *Good Practice Statements*?

We have taken Informas' *Good Practice Statements* and applied them directly to the England context. There will be some *Good Practice Statements* that participants in the workshop believe could be improved. Please feed these suggestions back to the Food Foundation (who will in turn pass them to Informas) or to Informas network members directly. Informas network members who will be present in the workshop are:

Dr Tim Lobstein
Dr Corinna Hawkes
Dr Mike Rayner

What is the online / email consultation which will follow this workshop?

All members of the Expert Group (those who have attended the workshop and those who have not) will be consulted by E-mail after the workshop and asked to prioritise the actions proposed at the workshop. They will be asked to prioritise the importance of each action (taking into account the relative need, impact, effects on equity, and any other positive and negative effects of the action). In addition, they will be asked to prioritise the likely achievability of the recommended actions (taking into account the relative feasibility, acceptability, affordability, and efficiency of the action).

What will the action statements be used for?

These statements, once finalized and prioritized, will be used as a collective reference point of expert consensus on priorities for policy and infrastructure support change. The Food Foundation will use them to underpin its work (in collaboration with others) and we hope that they will also be useful for the many other stakeholders working to influence policy in the UK.