



Change and innovation in food aid provision in Sussex and Southwest London during the Covid-19 pandemic

Journal:	<i>British Food Journal</i>
Manuscript ID	BFJ-05-2022-0442.R1
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	food aid, food insecurity, food bank, Poverty, food waste, surplus food

Table 1: Organisations interviewed within the project

Interviews within Southwest London (n=8)	Interviews within Sussex (n=20)
<p><u>One interview each:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 1 food partnership ● 5 food aid providers <p><u>Two interviews:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 1 food aid provider 	<p><u>One interview each:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 5 food aid providers ● 2 complex organisations¹ ● 2 food partnerships ● 1 national supermarket ● 1 surplus food provider <p><u>Two interviews:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 1 food partnership ● 1 complex organisation <p><u>Three interviews:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 1 surplus food distributor <p>In addition, an interview with Thapa Karki, an academic researching food aid in Sussex was carried out.</p>
Sites visited	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Food aid provider, Southwest London (1 site visited on multiple occasions) ● Surplus food distributor, Sussex (1 site visited on multiple occasions) ● Food aid provider, Sussex (1 site visited twice) ● Complex organisation, Sussex (1 site visited twice) ● Food partnership, Sussex (1 site visited twice) ● 2 complex organisations, Sussex (1 site visited once) ● 2 Food aid providers, Sussex (1 site visited once) 	

¹ An organisation that collects and distributes surplus food as well as provides food aid.

Change and innovation in food aid provision in Sussex and Southwest London during the Covid-19 pandemic

Abstract

Purpose

The purpose of this paper is to examine how food aid providers in Sussex and Southwest London responded and managed during the pandemic.

Methodological approach

Our methodological approach consists of three inter-related layers. A qualitative description research approach based on naturalistic inquiry, was used, supplemented by site visits and personal observations.

Findings

The pandemic catalysed dramatic, often positive, changes to the provision of food aid, with a move away from the traditional food bank model. It brought about increased coordination and oversight, as well as the upscaling of capabilities, infrastructure, and provisions.

Originality/value

The paper contributes to the literature on food aid in the UK. It provides evidence for how providers are transforming the sector for the better and potentially helping to deal with the cost-of-living crisis.

Funding statement: The research has been supported by a small research grant from the Centre for Research into Communities, Identities and Difference (CResCID), and a London Met Research Transformation grant.

Key words: food aid; food insecurity; food waste; surplus food; food bank; Covid-19 pandemic; poverty

Introduction

The Covid-19 pandemic brought about a dramatic increase in both the need and demand for food aid, driven by difficulties in accessibility, availability, utilisation and stability, the four pillars of food security (FAO, 2006). In many areas this demand was several times higher than pre-pandemic, affecting many who had never previously experienced food insecurity (BHFP, 2020; Lambie-Mumford and Loopstra, 2020; Macaninch *et al.*, 2020; Trussell Trust, 2022).

Over the past two years, since the beginning of the pandemic, we have researched food insecurity and the provision of food aid in Sussex and Southwest London. Our aim was to explore the provision of food aid in 'real time', to understand how food aid providers responded and managed during this unprecedented crisis. This is important for several reasons beyond contributing to the literature on food aid and addressing a gap in how it was addressed during the pandemic. Understanding the response provides an indication to the future of food aid in the UK and to whether the problems faced by providers pre-pandemic, from lack of government support to struggles accessing resources (see, for example, Garthwaite, 2016; Lambie-Mumford 2017; and Riches, 2018), have been addressed. Additionally, is important because it could support the response to the cost-of-living crisis, where the need for food aid might potentially be greater.

Our main finding is that providers did indeed address many of the problems they faced pre-pandemic. They responded to the pandemic by rapidly changing and innovating operations and practices. The pandemic caused providers not only to rethink how best to provide food aid and respond to increasing food insecurity, but also to think about broader and related issues, such as poverty alleviation, food waste, and sustainability. Based on these findings, we argue that if the changes and innovations are maintained, they have the potential of not only transforming the food aid sector and food aid for the better, but also help deal with the cost-of-living crisis.

Below we divide the paper into four main sections. First, we discuss the literature on food aid in the UK and the issues faced by providers pre-pandemic. Second, we explain our methodological approach. Third, we discuss and provide evidence of our findings, focusing on four key areas: improved food aid infrastructure; increased coordination; rethinking the food aid model; and going beyond food aid. We conclude by discussing the importance and implications of these findings and question the long-term durability of these changes.

Food aid in the UK

Food insecurity is not a new issue in the UK.¹ Since the implementation of austerity measures by the coalition government in 2010, the UK has seen a gradual increase in

¹ Food insecurity is defined as 'a household-level economic and social condition of limited or uncertain access to adequate food' (Trussell Trust, 2019).

1
2
3 food insecurity levels, reflected, among other measures, in demand and need for food
4 aid (Caplan, 2020; Garthwaite, 2016a; Lambie-Mumford and Green, 2017; Power *et*
5 *al.*, 2020). Leading up to the pandemic, levels of food insecurity in the UK were
6 classified as very high. In the most recent iterations of the biannual 'Food and You'
7 survey, 16% of the British population were classified as food insecure (FSA, 2020;
8 2021a, b); the Institute of Health Equity estimated that food insecurity affected 8-10%
9 of UK households between 2016-18 (Marmot *et al.*, 2020).

10
11
12
13 Despite rising levels of food insecurity, it has been argued that the UK government
14 lacked a clear policy response; indeed, one of the flagship policies to address poverty,
15 the shift to universal credit, has directly increased food insecurity, albeit temporarily in
16 many cases (Garthwaite, 2016a). In place of national policy, the response to food
17 insecurity has largely been left to the food aid sector, which includes a variety of food
18 aid providers, including community supermarkets, lunch clubs, and particularly food
19 banks (Caplan, 2016). Over the past decade food aid providers have become
20 permanent features of the unofficial welfare system in the UK (Lambie-Mumford and
21 Green, 2017; Williams *et al.*, 2016). This is particularly the case with food banks,²
22 which are the main food aid providers and on which the literature and popular media
23 have predominantly focused (Lambie-Mumford, 2017; and Lambie-Mumford and
24 Green, 2017).

25
26
27
28
29
30 To understand the response during the pandemic, it is important to examine some of
31 the issues that were raised regarding the sector, particularly food banks, pre-
32 pandemic. One of the main issues was whether they should address needs beyond
33 the provision of food aid, a term that has different meanings depending on the
34 organisation (Lambie-Mumford and Green, 2017). The Trussell Trust emphasises that
35 the purpose of food banks is short-term food aid, not long-term relief (Caplan, 2017;
36 Loopstra, 2018a). The emphasis on the temporary nature of food aid means that pre-
37 pandemic many providers focused on essential and long-life items and spent less time
38 and resources examining the underlying issues causing food insecurity.

39
40
41
42
43 A limitation of only providing short-term food aid is that many of those who require food
44 aid are already struggling with long-term food insecurity (Loopstra, 2018a). As
45 Garthwaite (2016b) explains, those who eventually make it to a food bank, overcoming
46 the stigma and shame associated, are already desperate and have exhausted all other
47 options; for them it is literally a last resort (Lambie-Mumford and Green, 2017). What
48 was clear pre-pandemic was that many users relied on food banks to supplement their
49 diets and mitigate their existing food insecurity (Loopstra, 2018a, and b).

50
51
52
53 Before the pandemic providers also struggled with several structural issues, from
54 recruiting and retaining volunteers to accessing sufficient food provisions. Caplan

55
56
57
58 ² The first food bank was set up in 2000 by the Trussell Trust (who now have approximately 1300 food
59 banks nationally); the Independent Food Aid Network (IFAN) operates food banks outside of the
60 Trussell Trust, and numbers approximately 900.

1
2
3 noted the 'running of a food bank is like running a small business and requires a great
4 deal of volunteer time and organization, well beyond the hours that the food bank is
5 open for clients' (2016: 7). There was also duplication of resources in some areas with
6 several food banks operating in parallel, while other areas, particularly rural, had
7 insufficient resources. We very much agree with Power *et al.* (2020) that the initial
8 phase of the pandemic exposed many of the above issues as well as the overall
9 fragility of the food aid sector.
10
11
12

13 The issues faced by food aid providers and how these should be addressed, are of
14 interest not only for dealing with food insecurity. Food insecurity is strongly related to
15 inequality and poverty and inextricably linked to health outcomes; the pandemic
16 demonstrated that economic and social inequalities lead to differentiated health and
17 mortality outcomes (Belanger *et al.*, 2020; Marmot *et al.*, 2020). Underlying levels of
18 inequality in the UK are high with large difference in healthy life expectancy between
19 the most and least deprived parts of the country (ONS, 2021a, and b). Pre-pandemic
20 an estimated 26.9% of households would need to spend more than a quarter of their
21 disposable income (after housing costs) to meet the recommended healthy eating
22 guidelines (Public Health England, 2016; Scott *et al.*, 2018). Lone parents and larger
23 families were most likely to struggle to meet the minimum food budget standard for a
24 healthy and socially acceptable diet (O'Connell *et al.*, 2019). This is not surprising as
25 those on the lowest incomes have less access to a healthy diet (Maguire and
26 Monsivais, 2015), and greater prevalence of lifestyle-related conditions, such as
27 cardiovascular disease (Baker, 2019). In short, how providers responded and
28 managed during the pandemic has wider implications beyond addressing food
29 insecurity.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 **Methodology**

39
40 Our focus was to explore in 'real time' the provision of food aid focusing on two
41 geographic regions, Southwest London and Sussex, through the lens of those involved
42 in its provision. What we wanted to understand was how the sector and the various
43 food aid providers responded and managed during this unprecedented crisis.
44
45
46

47 The bulk of the research was conducted between March 2021 and March 2022, and
48 covers the period from March 2020, and the beginning of the first lockdown, to
49 December 2021. Our main objectives included understanding providers experiences
50 during the pandemic; identifying the changes that occurred or that were introduced in
51 response to the pandemic; exploring their impact on the provision of food aid; and
52 developing an understanding of their long-term durability. We focused on the above
53 regions for practical and conceptual reasons. Restrictions on travel during the
54 pandemic forced us to focus on areas we already knew well, could travel to safely,
55 and where we had existing networks of contacts.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Our methodological approach consists of three inter-related layers. A qualitative
4 description research approach (Moisey et al., 2022; Bradshaw et al., 2017) based on
5 naturalistic inquiry (Sandelowski, 2000), was used, supplemented by site visits and
6 personal observations. First, we conducted semi-structured interviews with those in
7 charge of providing food aid in a range of organisations, including food banks, lunch
8 clubs, community supermarkets, as well as key stakeholders who support them, such
9 as food partnerships, local authorities, and surplus food distributors. Purposive
10 sampling was used with participants identified using a snowballing technique (Parker
11 et al, 2019), whereby initial contacts identified from desk research suggested others
12 working in the field. The only inclusion criteria were individuals working to provide food
13 aid throughout the pandemic in the specific geographical areas. Interviews were
14 carried out initially online and after restrictions were lifted, in person. A bespoke
15 interview guide was used for consistency (shown below). Interviews aimed to explore
16 interviewees' experience of food aid prior to and during the pandemic, the impact of
17 the pandemic, the meaning of food aid involvement for the individuals and their views
18 on the likely durability of changes which had occurred. Interviews typically lasted 30-
19 45 minutes, and were audio-recorded, transcribed, and thematically analysed.
20 Transcriptions and recordings were analysed separately by the research team in an
21 iterative process to identify the main themes and subthemes which were manually
22 coded (Braun & Clarke, 2006). These were collated and illustrative quotes using
23 pseudonyms for participants were chosen for each theme. The headline topics
24 discussed in the interviews were:

- 25 1. What is your involvement with food aid?
- 26 2. What was your experience of food aid before the pandemic?
- 27 3. How did this change in response to the pandemic?
- 28 4. What does your involvement with food aid mean to you?

29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Second, the interviews were supplemented by visits to several key sites of food aid provision, during which the facilities and methodologies adopted during the pandemic were seen. During the visit, the contact at the organisation was interviewed, however, these sessions were not audio-recorded and are not included in Table 1 below.

Lastly, one of us has been volunteering with one of the main surplus food providers in Sussex and Southwest London since March 2020, and another with a food aid provider in Southwest London since January 2022, another reason why we chose to focus on these two areas. Once the initial research grant was awarded in February 2021 and ethical approval for the research was granted, the nature of the research was made clear to the organisations and to all those working and volunteering with them.

The research was carried out with ethical approval from the University Research Ethics Committee with informed consent of all participants. One important caveat is that within the timeframe mentioned above we did not interview claimants of food aid.

Results

A total of 28 semi-structured interviews were undertaken up to December 2021 (20 in Sussex and eight in Southwest London). In total eight separate sites were visited, several of which were visited more than once (see Table 1).

(Insert table 1 here)

Major themes identified.

Increased need for support during the pandemic occurred in both geographical areas. This resulted from difficulties with all four pillars of food insecurity; availability (e.g. food shortages), access (e.g. difficulty obtaining online shopping slots), utilisation (e.g. physical ill-health) and stability (e.g. altered employment and income). Innovations occurred across the sector to meet this need including enhanced cooperation, communication and sharing of food and resources. Altered organisational practices to accommodate different demands were reported (e.g. food deliveries rather than collections). A more holistic response seeking to address underlying issues (e.g. development of a structured local response over time), signposting to appropriate support (e.g. benefits support) and enhanced skills development (e.g. provision of recipe boxes), was also found. The extent to which improvements identified will be possible to sustain longer term is unclear. Each of these will be discussed in turn.

Key Findings

1. Food aid infrastructure

When asked where the food provided came from pre-pandemic, Olga, the project manager of a food partnership overseeing and coordinating several food aid providers said:

‘I think they were mostly reliant on donations, er, donations of food and obviously cash donations and buying food’.

Running a food bank and/or providing food aid has always been complex (Caplan, 2016). Pre-pandemic, many providers struggled with unreliable food donations and access to surplus food. Most relied on donated food, often of random nature and quality, supplemented with food purchased through monetary donations, and surplus food provided by distributors. Surplus distributors in turn did not always have access to stable and reliable food provisions, the majority coming from UK supermarkets.

The unreliability of the system was also due to the lack of clear structures in food donations including ‘a lack of legislative framework requiring supermarkets to donate surplus food’ (Thapa Karki *et al.*, 2021: 575). Food redistribution initiatives have been largely fragmented and independent from each other (Facchini *et al.*, 2018). As

1
2
3 observed by several of the providers we engaged with, on the one hand, pre-pandemic
4 surplus food providers could not always be relied on. On the other hand, in some areas
5 they appeared to compete. When asked whether there was a need to alleviate 'turf'
6 issues between surplus food distributors, Asya, the project manager of a food
7 partnership overseeing and coordinating many providers, replied: 'yeah, very much
8 so'. 'The development of a larger and more coherent food surplus redistribution
9 system' was argued (Facchini *et al.*, 2018) as a step in the right direction, in terms of
10 addressing food waste and other aspects of the food supply chain. For example,
11 leaving aside the debate over whether surplus food is the appropriate solution to food
12 insecurity (Caraher and Furey, 2017), establishing a more coherent food surplus
13 system held promise of providing stable supplies to food aid providers. This is exactly
14 what happened during the pandemic.
15
16
17
18
19

20 The early stages of the pandemic were chaotic. Many providers either shut down or
21 struggled to operate. One of the issues they grappled with was access to food
22 supplies. To ensure stable supplies, local authorities, food partnerships and the
23 national government stepped in. Local authorities and food partnerships provided
24 financial support and grants as well as coordination, and in some cases even stepped
25 in and created central food hubs to supply food providers. Alison, the manager of one
26 hub explained it to us: 'so the council and...the food partnership kind of got together
27 and said...we need some kind of strategic thinking here and we need....to mobilise an
28 operation whereby we can make sure that [food aid providers] stay open'. Food for
29 these hubs was provided by surplus food providers, donated by local businesses, or
30 purchased by local authorities and food partnerships from their own funds or from
31 grants they were awarded.
32
33
34
35
36

37 The role of surplus food providers was also clarified and strengthened. In the UK there
38 are a limited number of surplus food distributors, Fareshare being the largest. The
39 pandemic accelerated previous developments that anchored Fareshare's pivotal role
40 in this system, making the supply of surplus food to food aid providers clearer and
41 more reliable (Caplan, 2017). At the beginning of the pandemic, the UK government
42 also helped support this process by making large funds available to Fareshare and
43 other providers of surplus food, as well as WRAP³ (Parsons and Barling, 2020). In
44 turn, funds from WRAP were given to surplus food organisations, including Fareshare.
45 These funds helped anchor surplus food suppliers as the main suppliers for food aid
46 providers and paved a move away from a mostly donation-based aid provision.
47 Nonetheless it is clear that the move towards relying on surplus food providers
48 involves pitfalls:
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58

59 ³ WRAP (The Waste and Resources Action Programme) is a UK based charity that promotes and
60 supports sustainable resource use, including reducing food waste.

1
2
3 'so yeah we definitely need both together, I think if we were purely relying on a
4 Fareshare delivery it would be tricky. But, er, yeah we're able to kind of supplement it
5 with donations' [Olga, food partnership, Sussex].
6
7

8 The role of surplus food distributors also changed during the pandemic. According to
9 Mary, a regional manager of a large surplus food distributor, their role shifted 'from an
10 environmental solution to provide a social resolution'; from focusing primarily on
11 tackling food waste, towards supporting and supplying food aid organisations, which
12 included purchasing food using DEFRA grants for the first time. This meant further
13 expansion of their logistical capacities, including storage and distribution, and further
14 establishing surplus food distributors as the main vehicle for supplying food aid
15 providers.
16
17
18

19
20 Upscaling of operations and resources for surplus food distributors and clarification of
21 their roles and distribution infrastructure was also aided by actions taken by national
22 supermarkets. During the pandemic they coordinated and provided additional support
23 to surplus food distributors.
24
25
26

27 [Pre-pandemic] '...we had less idea of what was coming in erm, because it
28 would just turn up. Nowadays [the surplus distributor] have done something with
29 Salesforce which means we get more oversight on what's coming in [James,
30 operations manager for a surplus food distributor, Sussex].
31
32

33 In many parts of the country, supermarkets clarified their provision of surplus food by
34 designating one charity that would be responsible for collecting food from each
35 supermarket branch:
36
37
38

39 'So it's not necessarily FareShare that are coming in at the end of the night to
40 a [branch], it could be City Harvest, it could be any other local charity' [Helen, regional
41 community engagement manager for a national supermarket].
42
43

44 In summary, the pandemic brought about a more coherent food surplus system and a
45 clearer and more central role for surplus food providers. This is a substantive change
46 for two key reasons. First, it shifts the UK towards a US style food aid provision system
47 (Martin, 2021; Riches, 2017) with large distribution depots (food banks in the US)
48 supplying front line food aid providers. Second, it provides the UK government, as well
49 as local authorities and food partnerships, with a direct avenue to step in and support
50 food aid provision in case of a national crisis.
51
52
53

54 **2. Increased coordination**

55
56
57 Prior to the pandemic, the extent to which food aid providers, cooperated appeared
58 variable. According to Thapa Karki, who mapped the architecture of food aid
59 distribution in Sussex pre-pandemic, much of the coordination was based on individual
60

1
2
3 relationships. This was problematic 'because every time this person moves away, [the
4 providers] have to start again'. The lack of sustained coordination, as well as the
5 limited resources many had access to, also likely contributed to a sometimes-
6 competitive attitude:
7
8

9
10 'So, for example if that organisation was trying to fund raise for something and
11 actually there's another organisation that's going in for the same funding bid, they
12 would get less' [Mary, surplus food distributor, Sussex]
13
14

15 The sudden onset of the pandemic and increased need for support required a
16 paradigmatic shift in attitude. Almost overnight, new partnerships and support
17 networks developed among food aid providers to coordinate responses and share
18 resources:
19
20

21 'So we had meetings, you know, with other food banks and we were able to, if
22 we had extra food or sources of food, we could put people in touch with it' [Catherine,
23 food aid provider, Sussex].
24
25

26
27 Increased cooperation and coordination extended beyond simply communicating and
28 sharing resources better. It started in the first few weeks of the first lockdown with a
29 triaging system, coordinated by food partnerships,⁴ supported by local authorities, to
30 assess levels of need and to collect surplus food, from the many closed hospitality
31 venues. It continued with food partnerships coordinating food purchasing and
32 deliveries to those in need, and in some areas creating central hubs for the
33 coordination and distribution of resources, including volunteers. Food partnerships
34 were well placed to use their networks. They could quickly identify the local capacity
35 and level of need and help establish and strengthen relationships. Their centrality to
36 the provision of food aid was highlighted in numerous interviews:
37
38
39
40

41 'Yeah, I would say Food Partnership were, were pretty instrumental in, in getting
42 everyone sort of together and meeting - and getting different parties together and -
43 erm, to try and meet the need. They were definitely, yeah, important to that' [James,
44 surplus food distributor, Sussex].
45
46
47

48 '...food partnership, definitely, with the central, they had a central venue, and
49 they were basically going to the city, was erm, what do you call it, they were acquiring
50 food as a city. So that was orchestrated by the council and the food partnership'
51 [Cassia, food aid provider, Sussex]
52
53

54 The level of cooperation and coordination seen during the pandemic was, in
55 comparison to the pre-pandemic period, exceptional. The development manager of a
56
57

58 ⁴ These were either pre-existing or set up during the pandemic. In our field work, we came across food
59 partnerships in different stages of development, several of which were established either just before or
60 during the pandemic.

1
2
3 complex organisation told us that, even though he did not want to 'overly romanticise
4 it... there was almost that kind of wartime spirit that you hear about in the Blitz' [Pedro,
5 complex organisation, Sussex]. Relationships were either established or
6 strengthened, particularly between food aid providers, food partnerships and local
7 authorities. New working groups were established, and dormant groups were revived
8 to deal with the immediate need and wider issues concerning food aid. The project
9 manager of one food partnership told us of the weekly and monthly meetings with the,
10 among others, 'emergency food network', 'affordable food network', and the 'surplus
11 food network'.
12
13
14
15

16 This increased cooperation and coordination continued throughout most of 2021; the
17 CEO of a surplus food distributor told us in the summer of 2021 that 'there are
18 coordination groups and networks that have recently been set up in East Sussex and
19 ... West Sussex as well' [Kenneth, surplus food distributor, Sussex].
20
21
22

23 The extent to which these groups and networks are supported and managed in future
24 will be important. Sharing and community asset building has the potential to embed
25 resilience across localities, but it is not a one-way street. While food partnerships link
26 already existing community assets and resources, they also offer opportunities for
27 volunteering, education and training (Food for Life, 2021). Thus, they offer potential
28 long-term benefits for locality asset development, embedding skills and knowledge
29 locally which could act as a reservoir for other public health initiatives requiring
30 grounds-up approaches.
31
32
33

34 **3. Rethinking the food aid model**

35
36
37 'For us, because ignoring the politics of it, there is a value in feeding people
38 that haven't got food, but if that's all that you do, then you just become the bottom of
39 a failed system, you just become an enabler of a failed system in a way....so we had
40 reached a point where we recognised that just running a food bank in itself was
41 insufficient' [Brian & Luke, food aid provider, Sussex]
42
43
44

45 There was recognition pre-pandemic in the literature and among providers, that
46 providing food aid was not enough, as it did little to address the long-term issues many
47 faced, beyond temporary alleviation of food insecurity. And even that was not always
48 accomplished. As Loopstra and Lalor (2017) show, regular use of food banks did not
49 necessarily result in food security; regular users were often food insecure with poor
50 nutritional quality diets. In many ways, 'the existence of food banks conveys the
51 message that 'something is being done', but reveals that this is far from sufficient to
52 meet the need' (Caplan, 2020: 9)
53
54
55
56

57 One of the most striking things we encountered was the realisation, among all
58 providers we interviewed, that the traditional food aid model, in particular food banks,
59 did not work well. For some providers this was a culmination of past experiences, for
60

1
2
3 others it was an eye opener brought about by the pandemic, particularly for new
4 providers. As a result, all the providers we interviewed looked at ways to innovate and
5 change their practices, including setting up new social enterprises, such as pantries,
6 community supermarkets, and pay-as-you-feel cafes, to better deal not only with the
7 pandemic but also the wider causes of food insecurity.
8
9

10
11 One of the most immediate and practical examples of the changes introduced was the
12 relaxation of referral requirements; all providers recognised the difficulties of acquiring
13 referrals during the pandemic. As a result, all providers relaxed requirements for
14 referrals, while many new organisations did not require them:
15
16

17
18 'So we just said, no, no. It's absolutely fine. We will serve anybody at whatever
19 the need' [Pauline, food aid provider, Sussex].
20

21
22 Another change was the focus on delivering food, rather than relying on those in need
23 to collect it; particularly during the first lockdown, with social distancing, this was often
24 the only way of providing food aid. By the end of 2021, most of the providers we
25 interviewed continued to provide deliveries, albeit at a reduced level, despite the
26 removal of restrictions. Although primarily driven by the pandemic, these two changes
27 resulted in easier and more consistent access to food, and dramatically reduced the
28 stigma and shame associated with accessing food aid (see: Caplan, 2016; Williams *et*
29 *al.*, 2016).⁵ However, there was widespread recognition that food insecurity usually
30 reflected greater need. Pre-pandemic, most providers limited the number of times food
31 aid could be accessed using referrals. With the relaxation or elimination of referrals,
32 providers moved towards either expanding the number of times food aid could be
33 accessed, or in several cases putting no upper limit:
34
35
36
37
38

39
40 'When you come to us and hunger is a problem, we're going to take that away,
41 we're going to feed you for as long as it takes, you don't have to worry about that
42 anymore' [Brian & Luke, food aid provider, Sussex].
43

44
45 Despite the increased provision of food aid, many providers told us that just meeting
46 food needs would not alleviate the underlying drivers of food insecurity:
47

48
49 'There's a reason why they're needing food and it may be addiction. It may be
50 employment. It may be housing. It may be, you know, lots of other... but we - giving
51
52
53

54
55 ⁵ Reducing stigma and shame was also part of the reason for setting up new social enterprises.
56 Community supermarkets, pantries, and cafes, with either subscription or pay-as-you-feel models,
57 which offer users both choices over their food (in contrast to food parcels over which they have little
58 choice), and the option of making a payment if they can, reduced stigma and shame by allowing users
59 to give back when they were able (Caplan, 2020). Feeling valued and able to contribute is an important
60 principle espoused by those seeking to avoid stigmatisation in the food aid arena (Nourish Scotland
and the Poverty Truth Commission, 2018)

1
2
3 them food and just patting them on the head and just saying, 'Well, cheerio,' that's not
4 enough. We've got to meet their, their real needs' [Pauline, food aid provider, Sussex].
5
6

7 It was recognised pre-pandemic that food insecurity was multifaceted (House of Lords,
8 2020). However, at the core it is mostly about poverty and, despite official failures to
9 recognise it, a flawed benefits system, with its unnecessary delays and sanctions
10 (House of Lords, 2020; Caplan, 2020).
11
12

13
14 'Food is just one manifestation of a much greater need' [Morgan, food aid
15 provider, Kingston].
16

17
18 'The root of it is poverty. It's money. It's housing. It's the other things that there
19 are huge issues across the country' [Lorna, food partnership, Sussex].
20

21 Recognising the limitations of only providing food aid,⁶ all the providers we interviewed
22 either started to provide or expanded their existing provision of additional support and
23 resources to tackle underlying problems. All provided signposting to other services, as
24 well as direct support in accessing these. Many went several steps further. They either
25 hired a dedicated support coordinator, using grants acquired during the pandemic, or
26 provided space for service providers to come to their premises (dependent on Covid
27 regulations):
28
29
30

31
32 'Then people from the council came, we had people come to talk about physical
33 health, mental health, people to talk about housing situations, training, offering training
34 courses. We've had all sorts of different people come and do that, trying to sort out
35 their fuel bills and utility bills and things like that' [Catherine, food aid provider, Sussex].
36
37

38 The additional steps taken by providers, regarding referrals, access to food, deliveries,
39 and extra support, might not be enough on their own to dramatically alter food
40 insecurity. However, anecdotally they are very positive steps in that direction.
41 Additionally, and this is an important point to highlight, they also provide a new model
42 and way of thinking of food aid and the purpose of providers.
43
44
45

46 47 48 **4. Beyond food aid** 49

50 The pandemic brought about several changes to the food aid landscape. On the one
51 hand, there was a dramatic increase in demand, and many providers, at least initially,
52 either closed or struggled to respond. On the other hand, there was a corresponding
53 scaling up of operations and capabilities, with new organisations set up, an influx of
54 volunteers, more cooperation between organisations, and more money, from
55 donations and grants.
56
57
58

59
60

⁶ We were told bluntly that 'you can't just chuck food at poverty' (Bill, complex organisation, Sussex)

1
2
3
4
5 Pre-pandemic, many of the food aid providers we spoke to wanted to address issues
6 beyond food aid; some were already moving in that direction, while others did not have
7 the capacity. These issues relate to food insecurity, as discussed above, but also to
8 nutrition, culinary skills, food waste, sustainability, and climate change.
9

10
11 The addition of more resources, in terms of grants, donations, and volunteers, meant
12 providers were often more able, despite the increased demand, to consider and
13 address these wider issues. In terms of nutrition and culinary skills, this entailed the
14 provision of recipe cards, heavily subsidised, sponsored, or free cookery classes, and
15 in some cases prepared meals (fresh and frozen). These are important developments,
16 enabling users to gain additional culinary knowledge, confidence, and skills.⁷ In
17 addition, the transition from traditional food bank models discussed above included
18 new innovative practices, such as the provision of free weekly recipe boxes,
19 supporting cooking skills and nutritional knowledge:
20
21
22

23
24 '...we can be in the business of giving people maybe some tools that will help
25 them, so greater knowledge around cooking, and cooking skills, and then also
26 hopefully the opportunity and the means to grow something for themselves' [Morgan,
27 food aid provider, Kingston]
28
29

30
31 The provision of weekly recipe boxes to those identified as being in need is less about
32 supporting nutritional intake (since only one family meal a week is provided), and more
33 about gaining confidence and skills in the kitchen, spending time preparing food
34 together as a family and tasting new foods. In this, it resembles commercial options
35 available at a cost to those who can afford them (e.g. HelloFresh). A somewhat similar
36 initiative was taken by other providers that sought to provide heavily subsidised or free
37 fresh food boxes, working with local producers and/or farmers' markets:
38
39
40

41 'We were very interested in how you make the same quality of food accessible
42 to paying farmers' market customers in middle class neighbourhoods, and people
43 getting subsidised or free meals, so our real focus was, is this an opportunity for us to
44 experiment around financial models that will make that possible?' [Pedro, complex
45 organisation, Sussex]
46
47

48
49 Beyond culinary skills and nutrition, most providers paid increasing attention to food
50 waste, sustainability, and climate change. This was always the case for surplus food
51 providers but became increasingly important for food aid providers as well. The
52 importance of linking food insecurity, food waste, sustainability and climate change
53 was recognised pre-pandemic (Schnitter & Berry, 2019). However, the greater
54
55

56
57
58 ⁷ The coordinator of one complex organisation told us that they were: 'looking at trying to show these
59 alternative ways of thinking, teaching people how to grow food, teaching people how to forage, teaching
60 people how to cook, that those things can show a more self-sustainable model' (Bill, complex
organisation, Sussex)

1
2
3 involvement of surplus food providers and new providers during the pandemic,
4 particularly those concerned with reducing food waste and promoting more
5 environmentally sustainable food systems, into the arena of food aid, resulted in the
6 overlapping of the above priorities with tackling food insecurity. The idea of using food
7 waste as part of the solution to food insecurity is contested (Caraher & Furey, 2017),
8 including by some of our participants:
9
10

11
12 'The problem is if it's seen as the solution, then the underlying causes of why
13 people are there in the first place might not get dealt with' [Jane, food aid provider,
14 Sussex]
15
16

17 Nonetheless, the potential for use of surplus food to meet short-term need for food
18 was highlighted by some as also benefiting food waste and sustainability priorities:
19
20

21 'we could actually eliminate hunger throughout the whole UK if stuff was put in
22 place for collecting and donating this food that's otherwise being wasted so it's just
23 like a win/win for everyone really' [Deepak, food aid provider, Kingston].
24
25

26 The focus on food waste and environmentally sustainable practices was also evident
27 in the way organisations cooperated and endeavoured to upcycle food, whether
28 surplus food, left over from farmers' markets, or even surplus from food aid providers.
29 One example we came across several times was transforming surplus and leftover
30 food into meals, using community kitchens, which could then be offered in community
31 supermarkets, pantries, or via other routes to those who needed them:
32
33
34

35 'what they cook with is stuff that has been left at the end of the community
36 market....But often they wait until the end, they take everything that's been left and
37 then they cook with it, freeze it, kind of goes out in the community market so it's like a
38 second option for people to take it' [Olga, food partnership, Sussex].
39
40
41

42 This also illustrates the move away from the traditional food bank model we have
43 witnessed. Traditional food banks rarely provide cooked food (fresh or frozen) and
44 often do not have the kitchen or storage facilities needed:
45
46

47 '...the food banks don't have community kitchens, they're in churches or they're
48 places where they get dried food and people are coming to pick it up. But they can't
49 use perishable food because they can't store it, you know, they don't have fridges,
50 they don't have the space' [Fred, food aid provider, Kingston].
51
52
53

54 The project manager of one food partnership provided the rationale for the 'new' focus
55 on sustainability:
56
57

58 'The sustainability side of it and then the environmental sustainability side of it
59 as well because we're in a situation where we're in a changing climate which will affect
60

our food system and the first people that are going to be hit are the people that can't afford or just about can afford food' [Lorna, food partnership, Sussex]

Conclusion: implications, limitations, and long-term durability

When we started this research, we were unsure what we would find, but we did not expect the pandemic to bring about positive change. Nevertheless, this is exactly what had happened in the areas we looked at, and anecdotally in many other areas too. The pandemic catalysed dramatic, often positive, changes to the provision of food aid. In response to the pandemic providers increased coordination and oversight as well as upscaled their capabilities and resources. These changes leave the food aid sector better placed to manage and respond to the cost-of-living crisis if the changes introduced are maintained. Additionally, and maybe even more importantly long-term, the manner in which providers addressed the problems they faced pre-pandemic, including by moving away from the traditional food bank model, holds the possibility for a more humane and durable form of food aid provision.

We fully accept that the sample size, the geographic focus, and researching in 'real time' during a pandemic merit consideration when examining the findings. It is also important to point out that many of the changes we observed might have happened anyway. Nevertheless, the circumstances of the pandemic removed some of the barriers to change often seen. Grants from central and local government and donations from the private sector as well as the public, meant that it was possible to supplement donated food with purchases. It also meant that providers could buy vehicles for food delivery and equipment for food storage, and hire new staff, including those focused on supporting users. Pre-pandemic volunteers were often older adults, the group required to self-isolate during the pandemic. An influx of new volunteers, many on furlough, professionally skilled and qualified, took their place, bringing fresh ideas and energy to the food aid sector.

The question we are left with in the 'post-Covid' phase with continuous high levels of demand,⁸ is how durable are these changes long-term? Based on what we were told and have seen, it is likely that the increased coordination and cooperation among providers will continue. This is particularly important given the continued demand:

'You know, I cannot see it [demand for food aid] going down to level that we were at before the pandemic any time soon. So I think there has to be a continued

⁸ The introduction of a £20 uplift to Universal Credit payments in March 2020 (DWP, 2021), was widely welcomed, and made a substantial difference to many (Waters and Wernham, 2021). However, despite widespread concern this was removed in October 2021. Alongside rises in food prices, energy bills and inflation (Institute for Government, 2022), the cost-of-living crisis in the UK will make financial recovery from the pandemic a distant prospect for many families, so levels of food insecurity and the need for food aid will either remain relatively high, or further increase.

1
2
3 strategic kind of coordination between the different organisations that are doing this.’
4 [Asya, food partnership, Sussex]
5

6
7 Perhaps most importantly will be the role played by food partnerships. Given the
8 importance of coordinated working, it is to be hoped that existing food partnerships will
9 remain in place, since working relationships have been established. We also expect
10 the moves away from the traditional food bank models to continue. All the
11 organisations we engaged with were re-evaluating their practices regarding referrals,
12 choice, response to food insecurity, and wider issues concerning food waste,
13 sustainability, nutrition, culinary skills. Nevertheless, there are several worrying signs.
14
15

16
17 The move towards relying more on surplus food distributors raises several difficult
18 questions. If surplus food available for use falls (e.g. by more closely aligning food
19 production and imports with need, and reducing food waste), this will clearly benefit
20 the environment, but will reduce the amount available for food aid. This is already
21 happening to some extent, which raises long-held concerns that surplus food is not a
22 viable long-term solution to food insecurity (nor should it be); anecdotally we have
23 seen substantive fluctuation in surplus food levels in 2022.
24
25
26

27
28 In terms of resources, many of the changes mentioned above were made possible by
29 the influx of volunteers and the availability of additional grants and donations, which
30 are now in shorter supply. The ending of the furlough scheme has reduced the pool of
31 potential volunteers, and the national government and local authorities have made
32 fewer grants available. Most of the providers we spoke to were worried about the
33 future. They fear the end of the pandemic might give the wrong signal that the food
34 insecurity crisis is over, when it might be getting worse. When asked about whether
35 the changes introduced will be maintained, the project manager of a food partnership
36 told us:
37
38
39

40
41 ‘Yeah, I mean I really hope so. Some good stuff has happened so far and
42 there’s a lot of energy around it so I’m just hoping we can continue to do it and continue
43 to work on it ... so fingers crossed.’ [Lorna, food partnership, Sussex].
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- Baker, C. (2019), 'Health inequalities: Income deprivation and north/south divides', House of Commons Library, available at: <https://commonslibrary.parliament.uk/health-inequalities-income-deprivation-and-north-south-divides/> (accessed 14/09/21)
- Belanger, M.J. *et al* (2020), 'Covid-19 and Disparities in Nutrition and Obesity', *New England Journal of Medicine*, Vol. 383, p e69 doi: 10.1056/NEJMp2021264.
- Bradshaw, C., Atkinson, S. and Doody, O. (2017), 'Employing a Qualitative Description Approach in Health Care Research', *Global Qualitative Nursing Research*, Vol. 4 pp.1-8 doi: 10.1177/2333393617742282
- Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2006), 'Using thematic analysis in psychology', *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, Vol. 3 No.2pp. 77-101 doi: 10.1191/1478088706qp063oa
- Brighton and Hove Food Partnership (BHFP) (2020), 'Detailed Report of Findings from the Survey of People in Food Poverty, August 2020, available at: <https://bhfood.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/Report-of-findings-of-people-in-Food-Poverty-BH-Aug-2020.pdf> (accessed 12/05/22)
- Caplan, P. (2016), 'Big society or broken society? Food banks in the UK', *Anthropology Today*, Vol. 32 No.1pp. 5-9 doi: 10.1111/1467-8322.12223
- Caplan, P. (2017), 'Win-Win? Food poverty, food aid and food surplus in the UK today', *Anthropology Today*, Vol. 33 No.3, pp. 17-22 doi: 10.1111/1467-8322.12350
- Caplan, P. (2020), 'Food Poverty & charity in the UK: food banks, the food industry and the state'. Goldsmiths: University of London, available at: <https://research.gold.ac.uk/id/eprint/31672/1/Food-Poverty-and-Charity-in-the-UK.pdf>
- Caraher, M. and Furey, S. (2017), 'Is it appropriate to use surplus food to feed people in hunger? Short-term Band-Aid to more deep-rooted problems of poverty', Food Research Collaboration Policy Brief, available at: <https://foodresearch.org.uk/publications/is-it-appropriate-to-use-surplus-food-to-feed-people-in-hunger/>
- Department of Work and Pensions (2021), 'LA Welfare direct 8/2021', available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/la-welfare-direct-bulletins-2021/la-welfare-direct-82021#:~:text=In%20March%202020%20the%20Government,new%20and%20existing%20UC%20claimants> (accessed 12/10/21)
- Facchini, E., Iacovidou, E., Gronow, J. and Voulvoulis, N. (2018), 'Food flows in the United Kingdom: The potential of surplus food redistribution to reduce waste',

1
2
3 *Journal of the Air & Waste Management Association*, Vol. 68 No.9, pp. 887-889 doi:
4 10.1080/10962247.2017.1405854
5

6
7 Food and Agriculture Organisation (2006), 'Food Security'. Policy Brief, Issue 2,
8 available at:

9 http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/faoitaly/documents/pdf/pdf_Food_Security_Concept_Note.pdf (accessed 10/05/22)
10
11

12
13 Food for Life (2021), 'Growing networks and partnerships in community food hubs',
14 available at: <https://foodforlife.org.uk/whats-happening/schools/news-and-blogs/ffl-blog-0000/~media/21ebff0daa04498eb094f1b846df7f81.ashx> (accessed 12/05/22)
15
16

17
18 Food Standards Agency (2020), 'COVID-19 Consumer Tracker', FSA: London,
19 available at: <https://www.food.gov.uk/research/research-projects/the-covid-19-consumer-research> (accessed 13/08/22)
20
21

22
23 Food Standards Agency (2021a), 'Food and You 2 Wave 1', FSA: London, available
24 at: https://www.food.gov.uk/sites/default/files/media/document/fy2-wave-1-report-key-findings_1.pdf (accessed 13/08/22)
25
26

27
28 Food Standards Agency (2021b), 'Food and You 2 Wave 2', FSA: London, available
29 at: https://www.food.gov.uk/sites/default/files/media/document/fy2-w2-key-findings_review_final_0.pdf (accessed 13/08/22)
30
31

32
33 Garthwaite, K. (2016a) *Hunger Pains: life inside foodbank Britain*. Bristol: Policy
34 Press.
35

36
37 Garthwaite, K. (2016b), 'Stigma, shame and `people like us': an ethnographic study
38 of foodbank use in the UK', *Journal of Poverty and Social Justice*, Vol. 24 No.3, pp.
39 277-289 doi: 10.1332/175982716X14721954314922
40

41
42 House of Lords Select Committee on Food, Poverty, Health and the Environment
43 (2020), 'Hungry for change: fixing the failures in food', Report of Session 2019–
44 20, available at:
45 <https://committees.parliament.uk/publications/1762/documents/17092/default/>
46 (accessed 20/02/22)
47
48

49
50 Institute for Government (2022), 'Cost of living crisis', available at:
51 <https://www.instituteforgovernment.org.uk/explainers/cost-living-crisis> (accessed
52 15/01/22)
53

54
55 Lambie-Mumford, H. and Loopstra, R. (2020), 'Food banks and the UK welfare
56 state', in H. Lambie Mumford and T. Silvastii (eds.), *The Rise of Food Charity in
57 Europe*, Bristol: Policy Press, pp. 191–218.
58
59
60

1
2
3 Lambie-Mumford, H. (2017) *Hungry Britain: The Rise of Food Charity*. Bristol: Policy
4 Press.

5
6
7 Lambie-Mumford, H. and Green, M. A. (2017) 'Austerity, welfare reform and the
8 rising use of food banks by children in England and Wales', *Area* Vol. 49 No. 3, pp.
9 273–279 doi: 10.1111/area.12233

10
11
12 Loopstra, R. (2018a), 'Interventions to address household food insecurity in high-
13 income countries', *Proceedings of the Nutrition Society*, Vol. 77, pp. 270–281
14 doi:10.1017/S002966511800006X

15
16
17 Loopstra, R. (2018b), 'Rising food bank use in the UK: Sign of a new public health
18 emergency?', *Nutrition Bulletin*, Vol. 43 No. 1, pp. 53-60 doi:10.1111/nbu.12306Ci

19
20
21 Loopstra, R. and Lalor, D. (2017), 'Financial insecurity, food insecurity, and disability:
22 the profile of people receiving emergency food assistance from The Trussell Trust
23 Foodbank Network in Britain', June 2017, The Trussell Trust: Salisbury.
24 [https://www.trusselltrust.org/wp-](https://www.trusselltrust.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2017/06/OU_Report_final_01_08_online.pdf)
25 [content/uploads/sites/2/2017/06/OU_Report_final_01_08_online.pdf](https://www.trusselltrust.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2017/06/OU_Report_final_01_08_online.pdf)

26
27
28 Macaninch, E., Martyn, K., Lima do Vale, M. (2020), 'Exploring the implications of
29 COVID-19 on widening health inequalities and the emergence of nutrition insecurity
30 through the lens of organisations involved with the emergency food response', *BMJ*
31 *Nutrition, Prevention & Health*, Vol. 3, doi:10.1136/bmjnp-2020-000120

32
33
34 Maguire, E. R. and Monsivais, P. (2015), 'Socio-economic dietary inequalities in UK
35 adults: an updated picture of key food groups and nutrients from national
36 surveillance data', *British Journal of Nutrition*, Vol. 113 No.1, pp. 181–189. doi:
37 10.1017/S0007114514002621.

38
39
40 Mahase, E. (2019), 'A decade on from Marmot, why are health inequalities
41 widening?', *British Medical Journal*, Vol. 365, p. l4251. doi: 10.1136/bmj.l4251

42
43
44 Marmot, M. *et al* (2020), 'Build Back Fairer: The COVID-19 Marmot Review',
45 available at: [https://www.health.org.uk/publications/build-back-fairer-the-covid-19-](https://www.health.org.uk/publications/build-back-fairer-the-covid-19-marmot-review)
46 [marmot-review](https://www.health.org.uk/publications/build-back-fairer-the-covid-19-marmot-review) (accessed 14/09/21)

47
48
49 Martin, K. S. (2021) *Reinventing Food Banks and Pantries: New tools to End*
50 *Hunger*. Washington DC: Island Press.

51
52
53 Moisey, L.L., Campbell, K.A., Whitmore, C. and Jack, S.M. (2022), 'Advancing
54 qualitative health research approaches in applied nutrition research', *Journal of*
55 *Human Nutrition and Dietetics*, Vol.35, pp.376-387 doi: 10.1111/jhn.12989.

56
57
58 Nourish Scotland and the Poverty Truth Commission (2018), 'Dignity in Practice.
59 Learning, tools and guidance for community food providers', available at:
60 [http://www.nourishscotland.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/Dignity-in-Practice-Full-](http://www.nourishscotland.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/Dignity-in-Practice-Full-Report-March-2018.pdf)
[Report-March-2018.pdf](http://www.nourishscotland.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/Dignity-in-Practice-Full-Report-March-2018.pdf) (accessed 21/02/22).

O'Connell, R. et al (2019), 'Which Types of Family are at Risk of Food Poverty in the UK? A Relative Deprivation Approach', *Social Policy & Society*, Vol.18 No.1, pp.1–18. doi:10.1017/S1474746418000015

Office for National Statistics (2021a), 'Household income inequality, UK: financial year ending 2020', available at: <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/personalandhouseholdfinances/incomeandwealth/bulletins/householdincomeinequalityfinancial/financialyearendng2020> (accessed 14/09/21).

Office for National Statistics (2021b), 'Health state life expectancies by national deprivation deciles, England: 2017 to 2019', available at: <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/healthinequalities/bulletins/healthstatelifeexpectanciesbyindexofmultipledeprivationimd/2017to2019> (accessed 14/09/21)

Parker, C, Scott, S & Geddes, A. (2019), 'Snowball sampling', *Foundations*, SAGE Research Methods, doi: 10.4135/9781526421036831710

Parsons, K. and Barling, D. (2020), 'England's Food Policy Response to Covid-19: Review of Policy Issues and Interventions', University of Hertfordshire, doi:10.18745/pb.24277

Power, M. et al (2020), 'How COVID-19 has exposed inequalities in the UK food system: The case of UK food and poverty', *Emerald Open Research*, Vol. 2, p. 11. doi: 10.35241/emeraldopenres.13539.2

Public Health England (2016) *The Eatwell Guide*, available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-eatwell-guide> (accessed 15/05/22)

Sandelowski, M. (2000), 'Whatever happened to Qualitative Description?', *Research in Nursing and Health*, Vol. 23, pp. 334-340 doi: 10.1002/1098-240X(200008)23:4%3C334::AID-NUR9%3E3.0.CO;2-G

Schnitter, R.S. and Berry, P. (2019), 'The Climate Change, Food Security and Human Health Nexus in Canada: A Framework to Protect Population Health', *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, Vol. 16, p. 2531. doi: 10.3390/ijerph16142531.

Scott, C., Sutherland, J. and Taylor, A. (2018), 'Affordability of the UK's Eatwell Guide', The Food Foundation, available at: https://foodfoundation.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/Affordability-of-the-Eatwell-Guide_Final_Web-Version.pdf (accessed 21/09/21)

Thapa Karki, S., Bennett, A.C.T. and Mishra, J.L. (2021), 'Reducing food waste and food insecurity in the UK: the architecture of surplus food distribution supply chain in addressing the sustainable development goals', *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 93, pp.563-577, doi: 10.1016/j.indmarman.2020.09.019.

1
2
3 Trussell Trust (2019) 'The State of Hunger. Introduction to a Study of Poverty and
4 Food Insecurity in the UK', available at: [https://www.trusselltrust.org/wp-](https://www.trusselltrust.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2019/06/SoH-Interim-Report-Final-2.pdf)
5 [content/uploads/sites/2/2019/06/SoH-Interim-Report-Final-2.pdf](https://www.trusselltrust.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2019/06/SoH-Interim-Report-Final-2.pdf) (accessed 19/05/22)
6
7

8 Trussell Trust (2022) 'Food banks provide more than 2.1 million food parcels to
9 people across the UK in the past year', available at:
10 [https://www.trusselltrust.org/2022/04/27/food-banks-provide-more-than-2-1-million-](https://www.trusselltrust.org/2022/04/27/food-banks-provide-more-than-2-1-million-food-parcels-to-people-across-the-uk-in-past-year-according-to-new-figures-released-by-the-trussell-trust/)
11 [food-parcels-to-people-across-the-uk-in-past-year-according-to-new-figures-](https://www.trusselltrust.org/2022/04/27/food-banks-provide-more-than-2-1-million-food-parcels-to-people-across-the-uk-in-past-year-according-to-new-figures-released-by-the-trussell-trust/)
12 [released-by-the-trussell-trust/](https://www.trusselltrust.org/2022/04/27/food-banks-provide-more-than-2-1-million-food-parcels-to-people-across-the-uk-in-past-year-according-to-new-figures-released-by-the-trussell-trust/) (accessed 19/05/22)
13
14

15 Waters, T. and Wernham, T. (2021), 'The expiry of the Universal Credit uplift:
16 impacts and policy options', available at: <https://ifs.org.uk/publications/15528>
17 [\(accessed 19/05/22\)](https://ifs.org.uk/publications/15528)
18
19

20 Williams, A., Cloke, P., May, J. and Goodwin, M. (2016), 'Contested space: the
21 contradictory political dynamics of food banking in the UK', *Environment and*
22 *Planning A*, Vol. 48 No. 11, pp.2291-2316, doi: 10.1177/0308518X16658292
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60