medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.13.22275065; this version posted August 29, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Estimating Food Security after Nuclear Winter: Preliminary analysis for Aotearoa New Zealand

Nick Wilson,[1*] Marnie Prickett, [1] Matt Boyd[2]
[1] University of Otago, Wellington, New Zealand
[2] Adapt Research Ltd, Reefton, New Zealand
* Corresponding author: Prof N Wilson, email: nick.wilson@otago.ac.nz

Abstract

We aimed to estimate the dietary energy content of food exports in the business-as-usual situation for Aotearoa New Zealand (NZ) and then its contribution to food security after a potential nuclear war-induced "nuclear winter". From published sources we estimated dietary energy available from the major domains of food exports, with adjustments for wastage. We specifically considered a severe nuclear winter model by Xia et al (2022) ie, 150 Tg of soot ejected into the stratosphere. We estimated that the current NZ population has a dietary energy intake of 44.4 billion kJ per day (8686 kJ per person per day). Current major food exports are equivalent to 3.9 times this amount ie, 34,100 kJ (8150 kcal) per person per day. Exported dairy products were estimated to be able to provide 338% of all the current dietary energy, followed by exports of: meat (34%); fruit (8.6%), alcohol (4.8%), marine products (4.6%), and vegetables (2.7%). After a severe nuclear winter scenario that reduced food production by 61%, there would still be 1.5 times current daily intakes available from diverted exported foods (or 13,298 kJ [3178 kcal] per person per day). In conclusion, this country appears to have excess food production capacity even after a severe nuclear winter scenario that more than halved food production. Nevertheless, NZ Government planners could build the resilience of the country's food systems and plan to ensure that food can be fairly distributed with the likely accompanying post-war collapse of the global trading economy.

Introduction

The survival of human civilization, or its continued flourishing, could be threatened by a global catastrophe abruptly reducing sunlight reaching the earth [1, 2]. Such scenarios could include nuclear winter arising from a nuclear war [3]; a large volcanic eruption [4] (particularly if occurring at global pinch points [5]); and a large asteroid/comet impact [6]. Resulting global climate impacts could include a drop in mean temperature that would limit food production possibly causing a catastrophic global food shock [1]. Modelling studies indicate that the impacts of such catastrophes are likely to be highly heterogeneous around the world [3, 7]. It is sometimes thought, for example, that islands in the Southern Hemisphere might do better than countries in Northern Hemisphere landmasses during nuclear winter [8, 9].

Collectively these threats are not improbable. Estimates for the annual probability of inadvertent nuclear war include 1% [10], or in the 0.3% to 3% range [11]. However, the uncertainty may even be higher and could be increasing with the Russian invasion of Ukraine in 2022. Another consideration is the risk of major volcanic eruptions on the scale of the Indonesian volcano Tambora in 1815. This eruption cooled global climate and contributed to famines in parts of Europe, India and China [12]. Eruptions of even larger than Tambora

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.13.22275065; this version posted August 29, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

occur around 1.6 times per millennium [13], equivalent to around a one in six chance per century [14]. But some estimates put the overall likelihood of a catastrophic global food shock (of >10% loss of production) at 80% this century [15].

Other catastrophic scenarios include severe pandemics (such as those arising from engineered bioweapons), or global industry-disabling scenarios such as coronal mass ejections or electromagnetic pulses [16], that might isolate remote nations like Aotearoa New Zealand.

Vastly greater efforts are needed to prevent all these threats to humanity, but it is also prudent to consider what happens if prevention fails. In terms of catastrophic pandemics, past work has suggested that isolated island refuges could have a role in ensuring human survival. New Zealand appears relatively well placed in terms of survivability compared to other island nations, with it ranked first in one study [17] and only behind Australia in others [18, 19]. Self-sufficiency on dimensions including food supply would have to be assured, although the previous work also reported the large per person food production capacity of New Zealand [18, 19].

Past work for New Zealand on the impact of nuclear war is substantively out of date as it was done in the 1980s eg, by the Commission for the Future [20], the New Zealand Planning Council [21-23] and others [24]. Since this time New Zealand society has changed in many ways, including the expansion of agricultural production and the growth in food exports. The scientific understanding of the impacts of abrupt sunlight reduction catastrophes has evolved as well [25-27].

Given the above, we aimed to further clarify the food security issues for New Zealand after such catastrophes by describing the current food export economy as well as how food supply might be impacted in a severe nuclear winter. We focused on the food export sector as the data appeared to provide a much clearer picture of food production than the far more diverse and complex domestic food production sector.

Methods

Business-as-usual dietary energy intake of New Zealanders: Adult [28], and child [29], nutrition survey data for New Zealand was used to estimate dietary energy intakes for these population groups by sex. These estimates were then multiplied by the relevant estimated New Zealand population sizes for the fourth quarter of 2021 [30] to estimate the national dietary energy intake.

Food export analyses: Food export weights were obtained from the New Zealand Harmonized System for export data [31-33] and five-year annual averages were calculated for the five-year period ending June 2020. We ignored food export categories that were under a 10,000 tonnes annual average in volume.

Food wastage adjustments: The adjustments for potential food wastage are shown in Table 1. These used data from the United States, United Kingdom and Europe. Although work on waste has been done in New Zealand [34], this work did not identify waste as a proportion of specific food products taken into the household.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.13.22275065; this version posted August 29, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Table 1: Assumptions around inedible fractions of foods and typical avoidable food wastage (for food previously prepared for export which was then assumed to be diverted to the domestic market after a global catastrophe)

Major food export group (if over 10,000 tonnes per year)	**Estimated food wastage during transport from food production facility to retailers and then to households [A] [a]**	**Estimated inedible fraction of exported food weights (unavoidable waste) [B]**	**Estimated avoidable wastage for foods entering the household [C]**
Dairy products	1%	0%	8% (WRAP)
Marine food products	1%	0% (most exports assumed to be filleted)	8.5% (mid-point of 2 estimates: 6% (NRDC) and 11% (WRAP))
Alcohol	1%	0%	8% (value for all types of drinks) (WRAP)
Red meat products			
Beef and veal	1%	18% (bone) [b]	8.5% (mid-point of 6% (NRDC) and 11% (WRAP))
Lamb and mutton	1%	16% (bone) [c]	
Fruit			
Apples	5%	12% [d]	14% (mid-point of 10% [35] and 18% (WRAP) for fruit as a grouping)
Avocados	8%	26% [d]	
Kiwifruit	6%	18% [d]	
Fresh vegetables			
Onions (dry)	6%	11% [d]	16.5% (mid-point of 13% [35] and 20% (WRAP) for fresh vegetables as a grouping)
Potatoes (actually a mix of fresh & frozen)	7%	16% [d]	
Processed vegetables			
Peas (frozen)	1%	0%	14% for processed vegetables (WRAP)
Sweetcorn (frozen)	1%	0%	

Notes:

[a] Retail waste was estimated from wastage in a US study by the National Resources Defence Council (NRDC) [36] (Table 62 in this NRDC publication). This indicated that the weight of food waste at the levels of "food wholesalers and distributors" and "grocers and markets" was 20% that of the weight of waste at the residential level (we combined the amounts for the three cities in the study). We applied this value to the fresh fruit and vegetable categories (ie, multiplying the 20% with the summed values in columns [B] and [C]). For processed foods we could not identify specific values but assumed it would be much less than for fresh produce. So we used a guesstimate of 1% to account for some small proportional loss due to expired "use-by-dates", accidental damage and refrigeration failures.

[b] We ignored boneless meat exports and just used a value for the proportion of bone in a study of New Zealand beef (hind quarter, "commercial composition") at 18% (Table 2 in Bass et al [37]). Of note is that food can be extracted from bones (eg, to make soup) so that in disaster circumstances these are a potential food source.

[c] We ignored boneless meat exports and just used a value for lamb carcasses of 16% [38].

[d] Inedible fractions from an average of three European studies as per De Laurentiis et al [35]. Avoidable food waste in the household for the European Union was 5 kg/person/year out of 52 kg of fruit taken into the household (10%). For vegetables the equivalent value was 13% (9/71). Some of these values are probably conservative eg, the 16% value is for fresh potatoes, and would be lower for the processed frozen potatoes that are a component of New Zealand's exports.

NRDC: National Resources Defence Council, US wastage data [36].

WRAP: Data for the UK (Table 51 in this Report [39]).

Dietary energy data: For the food exports that were available for intake at the household level after unavoidable wastage (inedible components) and avoidable wastage, we calculated

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.13.22275065; this version posted August 29, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

the food energy available. This was done by matching typical foods within each food export category using the New Zealand Food Composition Database [40]. We used representative foods within each category eg, in the cheese category: "cheddar cheese, code F1015"; and for the apple category: "Royal Gala, code L1150". A full list of codes and the Excel spreadsheet is available on request to the authors.

Impact of a severe nuclear winter scenario: There is much uncertainty concerning the global impacts of nuclear war and if "nuclear winter" impacts would even occur. Nevertheless, to inform potential planning purposes we took a severe nuclear war scenario involving 150 Tg (150 megatonnes) of soot ejected into the stratosphere from burning cities following nuclear explosions [27]. This study estimated a 61% reduction in food energy production for New Zealand as part of a global analysis using data for major food crops (maize, rice, soybean and spring wheat) and marine fish averaged over the first five years. For modelling parsimony we used this 61% reduction across-the-board for food production, even though grass growth and marine food chains may be less impacted than crop production. To illustrate that this is indeed a "severe" case scenario we note New Zealand specific work indicating that "a drop in spring temperatures of 3°C would reduce pasture production by 34-66% in three representative locations, from the Waikato (North Island) to Canterbury (mid-South Island) and Southland (South Island). Pasture growth over the whole year would be reduced by 19-36%" [23].

Results

Business-as-usual dietary energy intake of the New Zealand population: The estimated dietary energy intake of the entire New Zealand population was estimated at 44.4 billion kJ per day (8686 kJ per person per day; Table 2).

Table 2: Estimated daily dietary energy intake of the total New Zealand population

Population group	**Average estimated daily dietary energy intake in kJ** (nutrition survey data [28, 29])	**Population size** (Q4 2021 estimates [30])	**Total kJ per day (billion)**
Adult men (15+ years)	10,380	2,041,970	21.2
Adult women (15+ years)	7748	2,105,180	16.3
Children* (<15 years) – males	7573	496,930	3.76
Children* (<15 years) – females	6703	470,720	3.16
Total	**–**	**5,114,800**	**44.4 **** (8686 kJ/person/day, or 2076 kcal/person/day)

* We used the energy intakes for the 5-6 year old age-groups. Intakes for the <5 year age-group were not collected in the survey data. For the 11-14 year age-group the intakes were fairly similar to adults (boys: 10,303; girls: 8323) [29].
** We recognize that this total might be slightly below the ideal for planning purposes since some of the adult survey respondents reported food insecurity, some people may have been dieting to control their weight at the time of the survey, and because of under-estimation of food intakes associated with the use of food diaries [41].

Food energy availability from diverted exports: The estimates for the major food exports are detailed in Table 3 and summarized in Table 4. After food wastage adjustments, dairy products were estimated to provide 338% of all the current dietary energy, followed by: meat

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.13.22275065; this version posted August 29, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

(34%); fruit (8.6%), alcohol (4.8%), marine products (4.6%), and vegetables (2.7%). Overall, these exports were estimated to provide 3.9 times dietary energy intakes for the whole New Zealand population (or 34,098 kJ [8150 kcal] per person per day).

Table 3: Food exports and available dietary energy estimates for New Zealand after adjusting for unavoidable food waste (inedible components) and avoidable food wastage (as per Table 1)

Food export category (if over 10,000 tonnes per year)	**Average annual exports (tonnes) – 5-year average ending June 2020***	**Greatest contributor to weight**	**Daily food energy equivalents (kJ/day)* [% of daily required for all NZ population, adjusted for waste]**	**Further details**
Dairy products (ordered by potential % of total dietary energy)				
Total milk, powder	1,895,691	Code=0402210019; Dairy produce; whole milk powder, concentrated, not containing added sugar or other sweetening matter, of a fat content exceeding 1.5% (by weight), n.e.c. in item no. 0402.21	218%	Harmonized systems “dairy products” AND “milk”. Exports recorded in kgs.
Butter	470,001	Code=0405100001; Dairy produce; derived from milk, butter, unsalted	82%	Harmonized systems “dairy products” AND “butter”
Cheese	336,226	Code=0406900011; Dairy produce; cheese, cheddar (other than in tins, not grated, powdered or processed)	33%	Harmonized systems “dairy products” AND “cheese”
Total milk, liquid	222,131**	Code=0401200901; Dairy produce; milk and cream, not concentrated, not containing added sugar or other sweetening matter, of a fat content, by weight, exceeding 1% but not exceeding 6%, UHT milk	3.2%	Harmonized systems “dairy products” AND “milk”. Exports recorded as liters.
Other dairy product, including yoghurt, buttermilk, whey	140,069	Code=0403901901; Dairy produce; buttermilk powder, produced by a spray process, concentrated or sweetened, with or without flavoring, added fruit, nuts or cocoa	1.3%	Harmonized systems “dairy products” remaining not fats
Meat products				
Lamb and Mutton, including edible offal and processed meats	398,267	Code=0204420001; Meat; of sheep, lamb cuts with bone in, frozen (excluding carcasses and half-carcasses)	18%	Harmonized systems “meat” AND “bovine” and “offal” AND “sheep” but not fats
Beef and veal, including edible offal and processed meats	473,405	Code=0202300001; Meat; of bovine animals, beef cuts according to the NZ Meat Producers' Board definition, of cow, steer and heifer, boneless, frozen	16%	Harmonized systems “meat” AND “bovine” and “offal” AND “bovine” but not fats
Marine food products				

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.13.22275065; this version posted August 29, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Food export category (if over 10,000 tonnes per year)	**Average annual exports (tonnes) – 5-year average ending June 2020***	**Greatest contributor to weight**	**Daily food energy equivalents (kJ/day)* [% of daily required for all NZ population, adjusted for waste]**	**Further details**
Fish	185,825	Hoki	3.3%	Exports Summary data – Quantity of Principal Exports
Mollusks	61,106	Code=0307430013; Mollusks; squid, frozen, whole	1.3%	Harmonized systems "molluscs"
Fruit				
Kiwifruit	512,435	0810500019; Fruit, edible; kiwifruit, green fleshed, fresh	4.5%	Harmonized systems "kiwifruit"
Apples	362,537	Code=0808100042; Fruit, edible; apples, Royal Gala, fresh, whole fruit	3.4%	Harmonized systems "apple"
Avocados	18,508		0.7%	Harmonized systems "avocado"
Vegetables				
Onions	175,110		1.0%	Harmonized systems "onions"
Potatoes (fresh, frozen or otherwise prepared)	97,334		0.9%	Harmonized systems "potatoes"
Peas (frozen)	38,507		0.7%	Harmonized systems "vegetable" search
Sweetcorn (frozen)	11,270		0.2%	Harmonized systems "vegetable" search
Other (converted from liters to tonnes)*				
Wine	257,006		4.4%	Harmonized systems "wine"
Beer	33,307		0.2%	Harmonized systems "beer"
Spirits***	12,104		0.2%	Harmonized systems "spirits"
Totals				
Total kJ per NZ citizen	–		34,098 per NZ citizen per day	As per population groups in Table 1
Excess factor relative to current intakes	–		3.93 times dietary energy intakes	See Table 1

Notes:

* We used the five-year average for exports between July 2016 to June 2020 to avoid too great an impact from COVID-19 disruptions.

** The export values were converted from liters to tonnes using the following values: Assumed density of: liquid milk products at 1.035 kg/L; wine at 1.011kg/L; spirits at 0.989kg/L; and beer at 1.030kg/L.

***Export volumes recoded in L.Alc converted to liters using the lowest percentage alcohol in the category range.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.13.22275065; this version posted August 29, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Impact of a nuclear winter scenario: The impact on food availability of a severe nuclear winter scenario is shown in Table 4. After a 61% reduction in food production, these diverted exports could still provide 1.5 times the current dietary energy intakes for the whole New Zealand population (or 13,298 kJ [3178 kcal] per person per day).

Table 4: Daily dietary energy provided by major food export categories relative to the daily dietary energy intakes of the current New Zealand population and after a severe nuclear winter scenario involving a 61% reduction in food production

Major food export group (from Table 3)	**Weight of annual food exports in tonnes (from Table 3)**	**Percentage of total NZ population intake (business-as-usual) (%)**	**Percentage of total NZ population intake after a severe nuclear winter scenario (%)**
Dairy products	3,064,118	338%	132%
Meat products	871,672	34.1%	13.3%
Fruit	893,480	8.6%	3.3%
Alcohol	302,417	4.8%	1.9%
Marine food products	246,931	4.6%	1.8%
Vegetables	322,221	2.7%	1.1%
Total	5,700,839	393%	153%
Total kJ available	–	63,658,104	24,826,661
Total kJ per person per day available	–	34,098	13,298 (3178 kcal)

Discussion

Main findings and interpretation: This analysis suggests that New Zealand's current food production for export is theoretically able to provide sufficient dietary energy for the whole population after a severe nuclear winter that reduced food production across-the-board by 61%. As such, this excess food production capacity would also be a resilience factor after other sunlight-reducing planetary catastrophes such as large volcanic eruptions and asteroid/comet impacts.

But despite this potential over supply, government planners in New Zealand should still consider preparing for such critical issues as:

- Ensuring that enough farmers keep getting paid to produce needed food (of the appropriate diversity) if export markets suddenly collapse.
- Ensuring that the domestic financial system doesn't collapse so that people still have money to pay for food. If there is a high risk of the viability of the financial system being threatened with hyperinflation and mass unemployment, then the government could plan for at least having a backup food rationing system and systems for prioritising food supplies to essential workers.
- Ensuring that limited supplies of diesel or biofuels can be prioritized for agricultural machinery, food processing and food transport (especially for the most efficient crops such as potatoes).
- Giving consideration to having plans for diverting grain suitable for human food that is currently used for animal feed. For example, an estimated 22% of cereals produced in New Zealand are used directly in food products (including malting barley for beer) with the remainder being used for livestock feed (ie, much of the wheat, maize and oats) [42].

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.13.22275065; this version posted August 29, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

As far as we can ascertain, there is no survival-critical food product that New Zealand would need to keep importing in a nuclear winter scenario. But ongoing food trade with Australia and Indonesia could allow for imports of discretionary foods such as coffee, tea and sugar (both countries produce all three). Neighboring countries like these may also be important trading partners for liquid fuels and machinery parts used for food production – so New Zealand may wish to plan for some ongoing food exports to these countries so that two-way trade occurred to the benefit of all parties.

Study strengths and limitations: A strength of this study is that it is the first to take such an in-depth bottom-up look at food security after a nuclear war for New Zealand. That is, other analyses have taken a higher level approach to dietary energy availability in the business-as-usual case [43] (ie, 9569 kcal/per person/day in 2013 for New Zealand), and in the post-nuclear-winter case [25, 27]. Nevertheless, our work is still preliminary and has many limitations, including the following:

- It does not consider the size of New Zealand's non-export food economy (due to its far greater complexity). This domain includes the food produced for the domestic market, household level production (eg, vegetable gardening and on lifestyle blocks), and harvesting food from the environment (eg, fishing, hunting and shellfish gathering). Nevertheless, one estimate for 2018 was that New Zealand produced 7768 kilotonnes of food, of which 2216 kilotonnes (28.5%) was for the domestic market. However, this previous estimate did not consider stocks from previous years and production waste (ie, losses during transportation and storage) [42]. Also, our analysis only considered major food export domains by ignoring average annual food exports of under 10,000 tonnes (ie, excluding such food exports as: beans, berry fruits, brassicas, capsicums, carrots, citrus, eggs, honey, pears, squash, and tomatoes) [42].
- The nuclear winter impacts were just for a severe scenario and lesser impacts seem more plausible. Furthermore, we assumed a 61% across-the-board reduction in food productivity whereas this would in reality be differential (ie, more likely for crops and less so for grass and marine-based foods). On the other hand we did not include a possible role for damage to agriculture from increased ultra-violet light after a nuclear war [44].
- It doesn't attempt to consider the post-war disruptions in food production from reduced availability of imported fertilizer, imported pesticides, imported diesel for agricultural machinery, imported spare parts for machinery, imported animal feed (eg, palm kernel expeller), and imported seasonal migrant labor (eg, for harvesting). Although New Zealand has a small liquid biofuels industry that currently produces from whey, tallow, and used cooking oil [45], this may only partially replace diesel used in agriculture unless production could be rapidly expanded. Similarly, although New Zealand does make some of its own nitrogen fertilizer, it is dependent on imports for phosphate-based fertilizer [46].
- Not considered were adverse impacts on food processing and distribution from workforce disruptions or failings with energy supplies (electricity supply or shortages of liquid fuel for trucks and trains).
- The nutrition analysis was only for dietary energy and so further work could consider the scope for achieving nutritionally balanced diets. Nevertheless, protein availability would seem to be an unlikely concern, given the current extent of exported dairy products, meat, and marine products. New Zealand is also self-sufficient in egg production and exports some relatively high protein plant foods (eg, beans) [42].

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.13.22275065; this version posted August 29, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Potential implications for further research and resilience building: Further work into food security after nuclear war and other sunlight-reducing scenarios is desirable, and should focus particularly on ensuring ongoing equitable distribution of food (as detailed above). Other aspects of enhancing food security resiliency after nuclear winter and other disasters that could be developed by central government, local government, and communities, include:

- Protecting soils, as previously argued for New Zealand on general food security grounds [42]. This may mean increasing tree planting on erosion prone land and better control of introduced pests (eg, deer, pigs and goats). The protection of high-quality soils from urban development may also contribute to greater resilience (a national policy statement for the protection of highly productive land was under development in New Zealand in 2022) [47]. Reducing soil erosion would also help protect other food sources: shellfish and other kaimoana (seafood) in estuaries, and mahinga kai (eg, eels) in rivers and streams.
- Reducing food waste at all levels in the food system, given the New Zealand data on the substantial size of this problem [34]. Reducing household level food waste could reduce costs for citizens.
- Incentives to make the agricultural sector less reliant on imported fossil fuels eg, via increasing numbers of electric vehicles and greater electrification of machinery. Using hydro-generated electricity for hydrogen fuel production (eg, for trucks and trains) in New Zealand [48], could be given additional support.
- Incentives to support the agricultural sector to become less reliant on imported fertilizers.
- Supporting "best fit" land-use change that is suited to local soils, geography, and climate to ensure farming systems are as resilient as possible to climatic shocks, and supporting diverse farming systems [49].
- Supporting increased urban food production by New Zealand households (eg, fruit, vegetables, and poultry), in community gardens, and by local Māori agribusiness that can supply food directly to iwi members [50]. The New Zealand Government-funded think tank Te Puna Whakaaranui has argued that "empowering communities to produce and distribute food is a low cost, culturally inclusive approach to food security" [51]. They cite local examples such as the Hauora Kai Co-Op [52] and WELLfed [53]. Priority crops to promote (from a nuclear winter perspective), could be ones that are high in dietary energy per land area required eg, potatoes. Potatoes also have moderate tolerance to frost [54]. There are also frost-tolerant vegetables such as onions, turnips and beets (especially sugar beet as frost hardiness is correlated with high sugar content) [54].
- Building up marine food reserves through better management of coastal fisheries and expansion of the number and size of marine reserves. It has been estimated that "…effective prewar management that rebuilds fish biomass could ensure a short-term catch buffer large enough to replace ~43 ± 35% of today's global animal protein production" [26].
- Promoting a general shift to more plant-based diets as these are typically more sustainable, lower cost and healthier as per various New Zealand studies [55-57].
- Exploring the value of seed banks for seeds for frost-tolerant and frost-resistant crops.

The above measures would be a contribution to towards the co-benefit of strengthening the resilience of New Zealand's food systems, following Tendall et al's definition of food systems resilience, "including social, economic and biophysical processes operating at many scales" [58].

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.13.22275065; this version posted August 29, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Conclusions

Based on this analysis of major food exports, New Zealand appears to have excess food production capacity even after a severe nuclear winter scenario that more than halved food production. Nevertheless, government planners could build the resilience of the country's food systems and plan to ensure that food can be fairly distributed with the likely accompanying post-war collapse of the global trading economy.

Data Availability: All key data are within the paper. The Excel file with specific food energy calculations is available from the authors on request.
Funding: Centre for Effective Altruism Long-Term Future Fund grant (for MB).
Competing interests: The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.
Acknowledgements: Nil.

References

1. Rivers M, Hinge M, Martínez JG, Tieman R, Jaeck V, Butt T, et al. Deployment of Resilient Foods Can Greatly Reduce Famine in an Abrupt Sunlight Reduction Scenario (Pre-print). Research Square 2022;(1 April). https://assets.researchsquare.com/files/rs-1446444/v1_covered.pdf?c=1648840855. 2022.
2. Baum S, Denkenberger DC, Pearce JM, Robock A, Winkler R. Resilience to global food supply catastrophes. Environment Systems and Decisions 2015;35(2), 301-313. doi:10.1007/s10669-015-9549-2.
3. Coupe J, Bardeen CG, Robock A, Toon OB. Nuclear Winter Responses to Nuclear War Between the United States and Russia in the Whole Atmosphere Community Climate Model Version 4 and the Goddard Institute for Space Studies ModelE. Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres. 2019;124(15):8522-43. doi: https://doi.org/10.1029/2019JD030509.
4. Rampino M. Super-volcanism and other geophysical processes of catastrophic import. In: Bostrom N, Cirkovic M, editors. Global Catastrophic Risks. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2008. p. 205–21.
5. Mani L, Tzachor A, Cole P. Global catastrophic risk from lower magnitude volcanic eruptions. Nature Communications. 2021;12(1):4756. doi: 10.1038/s41467-021-25021-8.
6. Chiarenza AA, Farnsworth A, Mannion PD, Lunt DJ, Valdes PJ, Morgan JV, et al. Asteroid impact, not volcanism, caused the end-Cretaceous dinosaur extinction. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 2020;117(29):17084-93. doi: doi:10.1073/pnas.2006087117.
7. Robock A, Oman L, Stenchikov GL. Nuclear winter revisited with a modern climate model and current nuclear arsenals: Still catastrophic consequences. Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres. 2007;112(D13). doi: https://doi.org/10.1029/2006JD008235.
8. Robock A. Nuclear Winter. Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change. 2010;1(3):418–27. doi: 10.1002/wcc.45.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.13.22275065; this version posted August 29, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

9. Ord T. The Precipice: Existential Risk and the Future of Humanity. London: Bloomsbury; 2020.
10. Barrett A, Baum S, Hostetler K. Analyzing and Reducing the Risks of Inadvertent Nuclear War Between the United States and Russia. Science and Global Security. 2013;21(2):106–33.
11. Hellman M, Cerf V. An existential discussion: What is the probability of nuclear war? Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists 2021;(18 March) https://thebulletinorg/2021/03/an-existential-discussion-what-is-the-probability-of-nuclear-war/.
12. Brönnimann S, Krämer D. Tambora and the "Year Without a Summer" of 1816. A Perspective on Earth and Human Systems Science. Geographica Bernensia G90, 2016. pp48. doi:10.4480/GB2016.G90.01. https://www.geography.unibe.ch/unibe/portal/fak_naturwis/e_geowiss/c_igeogr/content/e39624/e39625/e39626/e426207/e431531/tambora_e_webA4_eng.pdf.
13. Lin J, Svensson A, Hvidberg CS, Lohmann J, Kristiansen S, Dahl-Jensen D, et al. Magnitude, frequency and climate forcing of global volcanism during the last glacial period as seen in Greenland and Antarctic ice cores (60–9 ka). Climate of the Past. 2022;18(3):485-506.
14. Cassidy M, Mani L. Prepare now for big eruptions. Nature. 2022;608:469-71.
15. García Martínez JB, Egbejimba J, Throup J, Matassa S, Pearce JM, Denkenberger DC. Potential of microbial protein from hydrogen for preventing mass starvation in catastrophic scenarios. Sustainable Production and Consumption. 2021;25:234-47. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spc.2020.08.011.
16. Denkenberger D, Sandberg A, Tieman RJ, Pearce JM. Long-term cost-effectiveness of interventions for loss of electricity/industry compared to artificial general intelligence safety. European Journal of Futures Research. 2021;9(1):11. doi: 10.1186/s40309-021-00178-z.
17. King N, Jones A. An Analysis of the Potential for the Formation of 'Nodes of Persisting Complexity'. Sustainability. 2021;13(15):8161.
18. Boyd M, Wilson N. The Prioritization of Island Nations as Refuges from Extreme Pandemics. Risk Analysis. 2019;40(2):227–39. doi: 10.1111/risa.13398.
19. Boyd M, Wilson N. Optimizing island refuges against global catastrophic and existential biological threats: Priorities and preparations. Risk Analysis. 2021;41(12):2266–85. doi: 10.1111/risa.13735.
20. Preddey G, Wilkins P, Wilson N, Kjellstrom T, Williamson B. Nuclear Disaster, A Report to the Commission for the Future. Wellington: Government Printer, 1982. https://www.mcguinnessinstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/CFTF-March-1982-Future-Contingencies-4-Nuclear-Disaster-FULL.pdf.
21. Green W, Cairns T, Wright J. New Zealand After Nuclear War. Wellington: New Zealand Planning Council, 1987.
22. Cronin K, Green W. The New Zealand Nuclear Impacts Study. Ambio. 1989;18:407-10.
23. Green W. Nuclear war impacts on noncombatant societies: An important research task. Ambio. 1989:402-6.
24. Salinger MJ. Nuclear winter: Impacts on the growIng season In New Zealand. Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand. 1986;16(4):319-33. doi: 10.1080/03036758.1986.10416811.
25. Jagermeyr J, Robock A, Elliott J, Muller C, Xia L, Khabarov N, et al. A regional nuclear conflict would compromise global food security. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 2020;117(13):7071-81. Epub 2020/03/18. doi:

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.13.22275065; this version posted August 29, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

10.1073/pnas.1919049117. PubMed PMID: 32179678; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7132296.

26. Scherrer KJ, Harrison CS, Heneghan RF, Galbraith E, Bardeen CG, Coupe J, et al. Marine wild-capture fisheries after nuclear war. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 2020;117(47):29748-58.
27. Xia L, Robock A, Scherrer K, Harrison CS, Bodirsky BL, Weindl I, et al. Global food insecurity and famine from reduced crop, marine fishery and livestock production due to climate disruption from nuclear war soot injection. Nature Food. 2022:1-11.
28. University of Otago and Ministry of Health. A Focus on Nutrition: Key findings of the 2008/09 New Zealand Adult Nutrition Survey. Wellington: Ministry of Health, 2011. http://www.health.govt.nz/publication/focus-nutrition-key-findings-2008-09-nz-adult-nutrition-survey.
29. Ministry of Health. NZ Food NZ Children: Key results of the 2002 National Children's Nutrition Survey. Wellington: Ministry of Health, 2003. https://www.health.govt.nz/system/files/documents/publications/nzfoodnzchildren.pdf
30. Stats NZ. Table generated in Infoshare: Estimated Resident Population by Age and Sex (1991+) (Qrtly-Mar/Jun/Sep/Dec). Stats NZ (accessed 12 March 2022).
31. Stats NZ. Volume of Wine on the Rise: Stats NZ; 2021 [cited 2022 25 March]. Available from: https://www.stats.govt.nz/tereo/news/volume-of-wine-on-the-rise.
32. Stats NZ. Spirits up, beer and wine down 2022 [cited 2022 25 March]. Available from: https://www.stats.govt.nz/tereo/news/spirits-up-beer-and-wine-down.
33. Stats NZ. Table generated in Infoshare: Harmonised Trade Exports (Aggregated Monthly - Financial Year) Total for all countries 2016 - 2020. Stats NZ (accessed 25 March 2022)
34. Waste Not Consulting. New Zealand Food Waste Audits: Prepared for WasteMINZ. 2015. https://lovefoodhatewaste.co.nz/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/New-Zealand-Food-Waste-Bin-Audit-Report-2015.pdf.
35. De Laurentiis V, Corrado S, Sala S. Quantifying household waste of fresh fruit and vegetables in the EU. Waste Management. 2018;77:238-51. Epub 2018/04/16. doi: 10.1016/j.wasman.2018.04.001. PubMed PMID: 29655924.
36. Hoover D. Estimating quantities and types of food waste at the city level. Natural Resources Defense Council, 2017. https://www.nrdc.org/sites/default/files/food-waste-city-level-report.pdf.
37. Bass J, Colomer-Rocher F, Johnson D. Relationships between New Zealand beef conformation classes, carcass composition, and muscle dimensions. New Zealand Journal of Agricultural Research, 1981;24:281-284. DOI: 10.1080/00288233.1981.10423388.
38. Teixeira A, Matos S, Rodrigues S, Delfa R, Cadavez V. In vivo estimation of lamb carcass composition by real-time ultrasonography. Meat Science. 2006;74(2):289-95. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2006.03.023.
39. WRAP. Household food and drink waste in the UK. Banbury: The Waste & Resources Action Programme (WRAP), 2009. https://wrap.org.uk/sites/default/files/2020-12/Household-Food-and-Drink-Waste-in-the-UK-2009.pdf.
40. The New Zealand Institute for Plant and Food Research Limited and the Ministry of Health (New Zealand). The New Zealand Food Composition Database. The New Zealand Institute for Plant and Food Research Limited and the Ministry of Health (New Zealand), 2022. https://www.foodcomposition.co.nz/.
41. Ravelli MN, Schoeller DA. Traditional self-reported dietary instruments are prone to inaccuracies and new approaches are needed. Frontiers in Nutrition. 2020;7:90.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.13.22275065; this version posted August 29, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

42. Soliman T, Greenhalgh S. Rethinking New Zealand's food security in times of disruption (Policy Brief No. 27). Auckland: Manaaki Whenua – Landcare Research, 2020.
43. Schramski JR, Woodson CB, Steck G, Munn D, Brown JH. Declining country-level food self-sufficiency suggests future food insecurities. BioPhysical Economics and Resource Quality. 2019;4(3):1-9.
44. Bardeen CG, Kinnison DE, Toon OB, Mills MJ, Vitt F, Xia L, et al. Extreme Ozone Loss Following Nuclear War Results in Enhanced Surface Ultraviolet Radiation. Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres. 2021;126(18):e2021JD035079.
45. Ministry of Business Innovation and Employment (MBIE). Biofuels (updated 11 January 2022). MBIE. https://www.mbie.govt.nz/building-and-energy/energy-and-natural-resources/energy-generation-and-markets/liquid-fuel-market/biofuels/.
46. Roberts A. Fertiliser industry - The industry today. In: Te Ara - the Encyclopedia of New Zealand (24 November 2008). http://www.TeAra.govt.nz/en/fertiliser-industry/page-2.
47. Ministry for the Environment. Proposed national policy statement for highly productive land 2021 [cited 2022 9 May]. Available from: https://environment.govt.nz/acts-and-regulations/national-policy-statements/proposed-nps-highly-productive-land/.
48. New Zealand Hydrogen Council. Supporting the progression and uptake of low emission hydrogen in New Zealand. https://www.nzhydrogen.org/ (Accessed 12 May 2022).
49. Bullock JM, Dhanjal-Adams KL, Milne A, Oliver TH, Todman LC, Whitmore AP, et al. Resilience and food security: rethinking an ecological concept. Journal of Ecology. 2017;105(4):880-4. doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2745.12791.
50. Dombroski K, Diprose G, Sharp E, Graham R, Lee L, Scobie M, et al. Food for People in Place: Reimagining Resilient Food Systems for Economic Recovery. Sustainability. 2020;12(22):9369. doi: https://doi.org/10.3390/su12229369. PubMed PMID: 2524901734.
51. Te Puna Whakaaronui. The global food system: The current state of the international food supply and consequences for New Zealand. (Insight Report) 2022;(30 April). https://fitforabetterworld.org.nz/assets/Global-food-report-30-April-2022.pdf.
52. Wesley Community Action. Join the Hauora Kai Co-op. (Accessed 6 May 2022). https://www.wesleyca.org.nz/what-we-do/wellington-region-fruit-vege-co-op/join-the-porirua-fruit-vege-coop/.
53. WELLfed. WELLfed - nourishing communities through food & connections. (Accessed 6 May 2022). https://www.wellfed.kiwi/.
54. World Meteorological Organization. Definition of agrometeorological information required for vegetable crops. CAgM Report No. 75. WMO/TD-No. 866. Geneva: World Meteorological Organization, 1997.
55. Drew J, Cleghorn C, Macmillan A, Mizdrak A. Healthy and Climate-Friendly Eating Patterns in the New Zealand Context. Environmental Health Perspectives. 2020;128(1):17007. Epub 2020/01/23. doi: 10.1289/EHP5996. PubMed PMID: 31967488; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7015541.
56. Wilson N, Nghiem N, Ni Mhurchu C, Eyles H, Baker MG, Blakely T. Foods and dietary patterns that are healthy, low-cost, and environmentally sustainable: a case study of optimization modeling for New Zealand. PLoS ONE. 2013;8(3):e59648. PubMed PMID: 23544082.
57. Kidd B, Mackay S, Vandevijvere S, Swinburn B. Cost and greenhouse gas emissions of current, healthy, flexitarian and vegan diets in Aotearoa (New Zealand). BMJ

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.13.22275065; this version posted August 29, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Nutrition, Preventiion and Health. 2021;4(1):275-84. Epub 2021/07/27. doi: 10.1136/bmjnph-2021-000262. PubMed PMID: 34308136; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC8258060.

58. Tendall DM, Joerin J, Kopainsky B, Edwards P, Shreck A, Le QB, et al. Food system resilience: Defining the concept. Global Food Security. 2015;6:17-23. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gfs.2015.08.001.