

ASPECTS OF FAIRNESS:		FAIR SHARE		FAIR PLAY			FAIR SAY	
Categories:		All having enough?	Avoiding too much for some?	All protected?	The same chances?	Enabling environment?	Free to make one's own decisions about food?	A voice in public decision-making?
FOR WHOM?		Minimum reasonable access to good outcomes	Limits to getting a share of good outcomes (generally involving moral restraint including in the exercise of power)	Equality of opportunity	Rights	Social structure	Autonomy	Voice
PEOPLE	As individuals	Access for all to sustained conditions in which one can lead a full life with dignity, including adequate nutritious food. Hence the emphasis in the Report on food security and food health	A person's share is such that it is NOT at a level or of a kind that is environmentally unsustainable, is produced at the cost of unfair economic or physical hardship to others, or forces others to bear the externalised real costs of production.	Equality of opportunity (real opportunity based on certain pre-conditions like adequate education)	Having certain rights e.g. as workers (such as to safe working conditions, adequate remuneration) or as members of the public (such as being free from misleading information e.g. food labelling)	All are parties to and beneficiaries of a mutually beneficial social order, funded publicly, that delivers certain basic goods such as basic education, health care, welfare benefits (or e.g. Universal Basic Income)	Autonomy of individuals in making responsible decisions e.g. about food, based on adequate knowledge (and consistent with the like autonomy of others)	Having a voice in public decision-making (relevance of food citizenship and food sovereignty in helping shape food options), whether locally, regionally, nationally or internationally
	As groups (ethnic, racial, gendered, faith, class)	A reasonable (average) level of access to well-being (economy, status, responsibility), compared with other groups (the lack of which is one basis for the Black Lives Matter's identification of injustice)	One group's level of well-being not being a causally significant factor in the lower level of well-being for another group (currently/historically) ; e.g. colonial legacies (which raises the question of reparations/compensation)	Absence of or reduced/ limited opportunity that is causally attributable to membership of certain groups (e.g. people of colour/women etc.)	The presence of equal rights legislation for all PLUS the absence of practices (often unconscious /institutional/culturally embedded) in which certain groups are not treated equally e.g. police bias against Blacks	The scheme of cooperation recognises the diverse needs of different groups e.g. diversity in culturally appropriate food and diverse models of food production etc.	Groups within countries have the space within which to make their own decisions e.g. about culturally important food for themselves	The 'wisdom'/ perspectives of different groups is given sufficient recognition, via appropriate forms of representation, in public decision making – e.g. indigenous peoples in respect to traditional seeds.

ASPECTS OF FAIRNESS:		FAIR SHARE		FAIR PLAY			FAIR SAY	
Categories:		All having enough?	Avoiding too much for some?	All protected?	The same chances?	Enabling environment?	Free to make one's own decisions about food?	A voice in public decision-making?
<b>PEOPLE (cont)</b>	<b>As nation-states and other corporate bodies</b>	A distribution of different countries' levels of well-being (or companies' levels of economic success), whilst not being the same (because e.g. of different historical circumstances), is not too different or such that any country (or company) cannot achieve (at least) basic well-being for all its citizens (or basic viability)	Relative power of countries (and of companies, particularly multi-national companies) being such that every nation-state (or company) has access to what is needed to ensure the basic welfare of its citizens (or circumstances for achieving economic success); ideally inequalities of power are such that they work to the benefit of the least powerful.	International e.g. Trade rules that enable all states (and companies) to make agreements that are to their benefit	Absence of bias and undue influence of some parties in drawing up agreements e.g. trade agreements on food that disadvantage certain parties	International cooperation, for instance through international institutions such as the UN and its agencies, to ensure basic goods, such as global food security	Nation-states (and companies) being able to make their own decisions and define what constitutes wellbeing for them without undue pressure /interference from others	Nation-states (and companies) particularly poorer ones have proper voice in international forums such as the UN (of for companies, national and international fora)
<b>ANIMALS</b>	<b>Managed (farms etc)</b>	Access for animals to healthy feed and appropriate living conditions that enable them to achieve well-being overall		Fair share in some respects occupies a special position in this framework: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are at least three main factors that determine whether and what extent fair share for all categories of humans is achieved: (a) Active re-distributive measures undertaken by governments to provide the conditions or basic well-being for everyone; such as historically the measures of the welfare state, and more recently the idea of universal basic income (fair play). (b) It is also something which is to a large extent achieved where there are the conditions needed for real equality of opportunity and there is a basic social framework of law, regulation and custom that guarantees rights including lack of discrimination and bias i.e. fair play again; (c) The third factor is the fact that different groups and individuals all have a proper voice (fair say) in determining public policies - hence the importance of food citizenship.</li> </ol> Thus, fair play and fair say are both instrumentally very important for achieving fair share - as well as being intrinsically valuable aspects of well-being in their own right.				
	<b>Wild</b>	Wild animals, whilst subject to minimal management e.g. for the purposes of culling for meat and ecological balance, have sufficient/appropriate dynamic habitats/space to live well (e.g. apart from positive rewilding measures, the countryside is managed to enable wild animals to flourish)						

ASPECTS OF FAIRNESS:		FAIR SHARE		FAIR PLAY			FAIR SAY	
Categories:		All having enough?	Avoiding too much for some?	All protected?	The same chances?	Enabling environment?	Free to make one's own decisions about food?	A voice in public decision-making?
<b>PLANET/ WORLD</b> [goal of achieving and maintaining a GLOBAL SUSTAINABLE BIOSPHERE AS THE 'HOME' OF ALL BEINGS WITH INTRINSIC VALUE, taking into account and integrating all four categories here]	<b>Inter-national</b>	All the above goals are pursued in the context of ensuring that the natural environment & socio-economic environment for humans are not degraded or are improved on a global scale (e.g. countries should not import food from other countries where the environment or workers are exploited)		2. The reason why animals or the planet do not have separate entries under fair play and fair say is because these aspects of justice/ fairness require the active involvement of rational human agents – animals and plants are not engaged per se in fair say or fair play. What this brings out is that these aspects of fairness require human agents with the appropriate moral and ecological understanding to be advocates/representatives (fair say) of what needs to be done for the sake of animals, living things or the planet, leading to appropriate rules and regulations which ensure by proxy fair play. This is not strange since it is already implied in concern for future generations who cannot speak for themselves either.  Hence this involves the responsible exercise of the (asymmetric) power that current human beings have in respect to future generations, animals and the general use of the planet. Human planetary management (including deliberately not managing or controlling parts of the planet) is a major causal factor in determining how other animals, living things generally and the planet flourish.				
	<b>Inter-generational</b>	The planet is shared with future generations of humans such that they will inherit a planet worth living in (this emphasises what is already needed to be done for current generations)						
	<b>Inter-species: all living things</b>	Living things, treated as having a moral status in their own right, generally have a healthy environment within which they can thrive (though always to some extent in competition with each other and humans) for now and the indefinite future (e.g. further reason to limit the use of chemical inputs in food production)						
	<b>Inter-species: species and ecosystems</b>	Likewise, species and ecosystems (and for some the biosphere as a whole) have a moral status, both now and in the indefinite future: they are not merely a use-value to humans (e.g. rapid species loss is not just bad for humans; it represents our failure to share the planet). The reality and importance of reciprocity between species including humans is recognised.						