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Poll: Is the Food Industry _____ ?

- Friend
- Foe
- Some combination of the above
Key Messages

• The complexity of prevention means we need thoughtful “lines in the sand”.

• “Conflicts of interest” can also be “convergences of interests”

• Slinging “rocks and arrows” creates silos rather than safe spaces.
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Food consumption also drives food production

Campbell's adding salt back to its soups

CARLY WEEKS
The Globe and Mail
Published Thursday, Jul. 14 2011, 5:40 PM EDT
Last updated Thursday, Sep. 06 2012, 10:24 AM EDT

Campbell Soup Company, which has become synonymous with sodium reduction and even showcased its healthier ways in a commercial, announced a new sales strategy this week: add more salt back into its soups.

Incoming CEO Denise Morrison told an investor's meeting at company headquarters in New Jersey this week that Campbell's will boost the sodium content of its products in hopes of combatting sluggish sales.
## Characteristics of Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Simple or Complicated Systems</th>
<th>Complex Systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homogeneous</td>
<td>Heterogeneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear</td>
<td>Nonlinear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deterministic</td>
<td>Stochastic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Static</td>
<td>Dynamic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Interdependent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No feedback</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not adaptive or self-organizing</td>
<td>Adaptive and self organizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No connection between levels or subsystems</td>
<td>Emergence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“Big Food” is heterogeneous
# BEHIND THE BRANDS: FOOD COMPANIES SCORECARD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Farmers</th>
<th>Workers</th>
<th>Climate</th>
<th>Transparency</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nestlé</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>45/70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Unilever</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>44/70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Coca-Cola</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38/70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mondelez</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23/70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>PepsiCo</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23/70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Danone</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22/70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>MARS</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22/70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Kellogg's</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20/70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Associated British Foods plc</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>General Mills</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15/70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Updated February 2014.
The latest version of this scorecard is available at http://oxfam.org/behindthebrands
Prevention System

Common Responses to Complex Problems

• Retreat
• Despair
• Believe the problem is beyond hope
• Assign blame, figure out who is responsible
• Simple solutions
• Galvanize our collective efforts and invest significant resources
Solutions for Complex Problems

- A reductionist paradigm is not that helpful
- Move from attribution to adaptation
- Support individuals / individuals matter
- Match capacity to complexity
- Set functional goals
- Assess effectiveness
- Build shared measurement platforms

- Distribute decision, action, & authority
- Establish networks and teams
- Build authentic trust
- Utilize the relationship between cooperation and competition
- Act locally, connect regionally and learn globally
- “Help it” happen rather than “make it” or “let it” happen

Adapted from Bar-Yam, Wheatley, Solomon & Flores, Greenhalgh
Solutions for Complex Problems

- A reductionist paradigm is not that helpful
- Move from attribution to adaptation
- Support individuals / individuals matter
- Match capacity to complexity
- Set functional goals
- Assess effectiveness
- Build shared measurement platforms
- Distribute decision, action, & authority
- Establish networks and teams
- Build authentic trust
- Utilize the relationship between cooperation and competition
- Act locally, connect regionally and learn globally
- “Help it” happen rather than “make it” or “let it” happen

Adapted from Bar-Yam, Wheatley, Solomon & Flores, Greenhalgh
The issues are not.....
Rather.....

Blind Trust
Simple Trust
Authentic Trust
Cordial Hypocrisy
Types of Trust

• **Simple Trust**
  – Trust taken for granted; devoid of suspicion
  – Demands no reflection, no conscious choice, no scrutiny no justification
  – Can’t be recovered if it is lost

• **Blind Trust**
  – Exposed to violation and betrayal
  – Evidence for distrust rejected or denied
  – Requires self-deception
Types of Trust

• Cordial Hypocrisy
  – Façade of goodwill and congeniality that hides distrust and cynicism
  – Destructive to teamwork
  – Makes honest communication impossible

• Authentic Trust
  – Can’t be taken for granted
  – Mature, articulated, carefully considered
  – Recognizes possibility of betrayal and disappointment
  – Must be continuously cultivated

Trust Helps with Complexity

- Trust is a way of dealing with complexity.
- High trust societies are able to form wide-reaching and successful cooperative partnerships.
- Low trust societies tend to be economic disaster areas and terrible places to live.

Other challenging lines.....
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“Science-Ploitation”
Other challenging lines.....

- Blind Trust
- Simple Trust
- Authentic Trust
- Cordial Hypocrisy

- Meta-analysis of RCTs
- Practice-based evidence
- “Science-Ploitation”

- Advice from clinical professional
- Health Promotion
- Food marketing
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Case against collaboration

• The only interest of the private sector is profit.

• Private sector partnerships with health orgs is only about buying credibility, positive emotions and consumer loyalty.

• Risk of partnering with food industry outweighs any potential benefits.

• Regulation and legislation are the only way to obtain the necessary changes to combat obesity.
A Short Story of Convergence

Food company plans to insert > 1M pedometers in cereal boxes. (Summer 2003)

Identified as a “natural expt” with potential to impact health knowledge, awareness, behaviour......

Canadians were invited to “donate their steps to health research” (January 2004)

Supplement to CJPH published (Spring 2006)

A Convergence of Interests?
Odds ratios of walking an hour per day (2003–04) in relation to COTM.

*Significant difference compared to the corresponding quarter of 2003, p<.05
Marketing vs Health Promotion

“Low sodium”

vs

“Hint of salt”
Independent Evaluation

- Funded by Robert Wood Johnson Foundation
- Confirmed: 6.4 trillion fewer calories (−10.6%) in 2012 than 2007.
- Caloric sales from pledge brands declined by 78 kcal/capita/day

http://www.healthyweightcommit.org/  
Could “convergence” improve quality of industry supported health promotion?
Not all “convergence” is a good idea
## Types of “convergence”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donation</th>
<th>Platforms for Discussion</th>
<th>Sponsorship</th>
<th>Alliances</th>
<th>Partnerships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charitable financial or in-kind donations that enhance each partner’s brand image.</td>
<td>Platforms for discussion are often created for information sharing. They bring together different actors to map out strategies for addressing changes.</td>
<td>Any form of monetary or in-kind payment or contribution to an event, activity or individual that promotes a company’s name, brand, products or services.</td>
<td>Alliances are groups of organizations that combine forces to address specific public health issues. They create informal agreements to provide programs or services to the community.</td>
<td>A partnership is a mechanism based on shared decision-making that brings together a diversity of skills and resources of various organizations in innovative ways to improve specific outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lower-level of Complexity  ➔ Higher-level of Complexity
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Your children don't care about these:

Because corporations are allowed to brainwash them on tv and the internet.
## Deepest held beliefs about food messaging

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academics</th>
<th>Health Care Professionals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requires evidence; “science has the answer”</td>
<td>You can demonstrate causality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge = behaviour change</td>
<td>Need to provide healthy eating guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry makes message confusing; consumers give up</td>
<td>Food messaging is an unwanted nuisance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deepest held beliefs about food messaging

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NGO</th>
<th>Private Sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educated consumers make healthier choices</td>
<td>Educated choice is a positive step</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uneducated consumers need healthy defaults</td>
<td>Bans don’t work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry is part of the problem and potentially part of the solution</td>
<td>Industry knows best how to communicate to educate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Building Authentic Trust – Barriers Cluster Map

1. Self-interest and fear
2. Non-constructive criticism & closed-mindedness
3. Stereotypes & Misrepresentations
4. Awareness & manipulation of knowledge delivery
5. System Barriers
6. Competing/Conflicting world views
7. Cultural, organizational and individual rigidity
Building Authentic Trust – Strategies Cluster Map

1. Partnership-enabling behaviors
2. Honest, interactive communication that enables common understanding
3. Reciprocal knowledge
4. Measurement & evaluation
5. Roles & clarifications
6. Collaborative orientation & methods
7. Personal & collective leadership
8. Support & resources

www.buildingtrust.ca
Lessons Learned Through Building Trust Initiative

• Trust building to address obesity needs a safe space

• Regulation is needed when competition is undesirable; Regulation levels the playing field

• Within sector trust is more difficult to build than between sector trust (private sector, NGO, government, academia).

http://buildingtrustinitiative.wordpress.com/
Benefits of Safe Space Discussions

• Catalyst for new collaborations
• Deepen understanding of other sectors
• Innovation/incubator/think tank
• Nurturing substrate
• Celebrate/communicate successes
Risks to Safe Spaces for Discussion

• Changes in leadership
• Stereotypes and assumptions about the motivation of others
• Betrayal by others in organization or sector
• Media influences
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Criteria for successful cross-sector partnerships

• Alignment of strategy, mission and values
• Personal connections and relationships (leaders on either side)
• Trust and mutual respect
• Good governance practices (re representation, transparency and accountability)
• Acknowledge and respect partners’ divergent interests
Criteria for successful cross-sector partnerships (2)

- Commitment of resources for carrying out partnership
- Strong project management with clear expectations of outcomes, benefits, roles and responsibilities
- Expectation management
- Vertical rather than horizontal relationships with equal power
- Built-in processes for review and evaluation