

# STATE OF THE RESEARCH: AN ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY ON EXISTING, EMERGING, AND NEEDED RESEARCH ON FOOD POLICY GROUPS

## Introduction

---

As food policy groups (FPGs)—such as food (policy) councils, food partnerships, coalitions, committees, boards, and other similar groups—become increasingly popular mechanisms to reform the food system, there has been growing interest among students, academics, and journalists to document and study their efforts. Food policy groups (FPGs) are groups that assemble stakeholders from across the food system to reform food policies and programs to be healthier and more socially, environmentally, and economically sustainable. The Food Policy Networks (FPN) project recognizes the opportunity to advance the field through raised awareness, evaluation, and learning from others. This current report—compiled with the insights gained from our advisory committee, the FPN listserv, and personal connections—aims to highlight the existing and emerging research on FPGs.

The annotated bibliography includes non-peer-reviewed reports, unpublished doctoral dis-

sertations and Masters theses, and additional research projects that are (to our knowledge) underway on FPGs. While peer-reviewed literature represents the gold standard of academic research, FPGs are still being interviewed for such research, and it is worth identifying what work has already been or is currently being done to avoid duplicative interview requests of groups. Given the rise of FPGs globally, we include research of FPGs and similar efforts from other industrialized countries to provide additional insights. We also recognize the inaccessibility of many of these publications to those without institutional connections, and hence highlight open-access research whenever available.

If you know of completed or ongoing research that has not been included in this list, or have additions to the research gaps section, please email [contactus@foodpolicynetworks.org](mailto:contactus@foodpolicynetworks.org).

---

**Suggested citation:** Santo, R., Bassarab, K., and Palmer, A. (2017). *State of the research: An annotated bibliography on existing, emerging, and needed research on food policy groups (1<sup>st</sup> edition)*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Center for a Livable Future.

## Table of Contents

---

Introduction .....	1
Annotated bibliography of research on FPGs .....	3
Research on individual FPGs .....	4
North America .....	4
Europe.....	7
Other and/or multiple continents .....	8
Research on evaluating the impacts of individual FPGs.....	10
Evaluation tools for FPGs .....	11
Research comparing <b>multiple</b> FPGs.....	12
North America .....	12
Europe.....	15
Research on FPG movement and/or how FPGs <b>connect</b> with one another .....	17
State or regional level.....	17
National level.....	18
Multiple countries .....	20
Research on activities/outcomes of work by FPGs .....	21
Food policy changes .....	21
Meaningful inclusion of diverse community members .....	23
Food strategies and plans.....	24
Economic development .....	25
FPG engagement at the federal level.....	26
Funding FPGs .....	26
Relationships with other institutions (e.g. cooperative extension, universities).....	26
Research gaps .....	27
Research on individual FPGs .....	27
Research comparing multiple FPGs.....	27
Research on the FPG movement and/or how FPGs connect with one another .....	28

## **Annotated bibliography of research on FPGs**

---

Key

**A:** Academic article

**D:** Doctoral dissertation or Master's thesis (unpublished)

**B:** Book or book chapter

**R:** Report

**P:** Conference presentation

**M:** Magazine article or piece of journalism

\*\*research in progress/underway

Open-access: no subscription required/available online for free

## Research on individual FPGs

---

The following case studies have documented the creation, structure, actions, and evolution of individual FPGs. Case studies focusing on one specific policy initiative or activity of an individual FPG are listed under the “Research on activities/outcomes of work by FPGs” on page 21.

### **North America**

**A:** Blay-Palmer, A. (2009). The Canadian pioneer: The genesis of urban food policy in Toronto. *International Planning Studies*, 14(4), pp.401—416. [Abstract](#).

Details the foundational history and present dynamics of Toronto Food Policy Council as an example of successful food planning and policy in motion. Notable contributions include: seminal food policy reports and processes; the celebration of local food communities and their champions; the on-going integration of rural and urban issues; shifting the discussion from food security to food sovereignty; and the launch of the Toronto Food Strategy.

**D:** Burak, G. (2012). *Analysis of a Regional Food Initiative: A Case Study of the Greater Kansas City Food Policy Coalition* (Doctoral dissertation, Humboldt State University). [Open-access](#).

This case study details the journey and evolution of the Greater Kansas City Food Policy Coalition, with particular attention paid to participants’ motivations for involvement and the process required to form the council.

**\*\*A:** Calancie, L., Stritzinger, N., Koch, J., Horton, C., Allen, N., Weiner, B.J., Ng, S.W., and Ammerman, A. (In review). Food policy council case study describing cross-sector collaboration for food system change in a rural setting. *Progress in Community Health Partnerships*.

Explores how an FPC in a rural community facilitates collaboration across sectors, what activities that members do to further their council’s mission, and what impacts such councils could have on their community’s food system and health.

**A:** Coplen, A.K. and Cuneo, M. (2015). Dissolved: Lessons learned from the Portland Multnomah Food Policy Council. *Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems, and Community Development*, 15, pp.91—107. [Abstract](#).

Explores the dissolution of the Portland Multnomah Food Policy Council. Offers insight into how particular obstacles might have been avoided or overcome, along with recommendations for citizens and government agencies hoping to foster productive public engagement and to advance local food systems policy.

**A:** Cuy Castellanos, D., Jones, J.C., Christaldi, J. and Liutkus, K.A. (2016). Perspectives on the development of a local food system: The case of Dayton, Ohio. *Agroecology and Sustainable Food Systems*. [Abstract](#).

Explores the current state of development in Dayton’s local food system, including the floundering of the Montgomery County Food Policy Coalition. Discusses some of the struggles faced—including administrative and political barriers, lack of funding, unequal education about the benefits of healthy foods, and varying consumer preferences—in affecting positive change in the area’s food system.

**D:** Dean, J.C. (2012). *The Iowa Food Policy Council: A case study* (Master’s thesis, Iowa State University, Paper 12827). [Open-access](#).

Examines the challenges and opportunities experienced by the Iowa Food Policy Council from its beginning to its collapse. Demonstrates the significance of establishing a legacy of convening that may continue without a formal structure. Also explores why stakeholders become involved and, just as importantly, why they stay involved.

**D:** Fiser, D. (2006). *Democratic Food: Food Policy Councils and the Rebuilding of Local Agriculture*. (Master’s thesis, University of Chicago Environmental Studies Program). [Open-access](#).

Looks at food policy councils and their potential to provide an accessible forum for the creation of food policy on local scales by soliciting input from stakeholders all across the food system, and to foster a sense of “food democracy.” Empirical evidence concentrates on Chicago Food Policy Advisory Council.

**R:** Hodgson, K. and Raja, S. (eds.)(2015). Exploring Stories of Innovation Series. Growing Food Connections Project. [Open-access](#).

A series of briefs that discuss innovative food systems planning and policy work from urban and rural communities across the U.S., including the [City of Lawrence and Douglas County, KA](#); [Baltimore City, MD](#); [Marquette County, MI](#); [Minneapolis, MN](#); [Region 5, Minnesota](#); [Cabarrus County, NC](#); [Cleveland, OH](#); [Lancaster County, PA](#); [Philadelphia, PA](#); [Seattle, WA](#); [City of Burlington and Chittenden County, VT](#). The work of food policy councils is included in some of the briefs but is not the central foci.

**A:** Koski, C., Siddiki, S., Sadiq, A.A., & Carboni, J. (2016). Representation in collaborative governance: A case study of a food policy council. *American Review of Public Administration*, pp.1—21. [Open-access](#).

Contrasts different forms of representation observed in a collaborative governance arrangement and identifies factors contributing to observed patterns in representation therein. Empirical evidence concentrates on a regional food policy council in the Western United States.

**A:** Larchet, N. (2015). From social emergency to health utopia: The social construction of obesity and the concealment of hunger in American cities, Knoxville, 1981-1985. [English abstract](#) (full article in French: “De l’urgence sociale à l’utopie sanitaire.” *Actes de la Recherche en Sciences Sociales*, 3(208), pp.40—61).

Based upon the archives of Knoxville Food Policy Council. It focuses on the conditions that fostered the emergence of an official epidemiology framing obesity as a question of access to “healthy products.”

**A:** Mendes, W. (2008). Implementing social and environmental policies in cities: The case of food policy in Vancouver, Canada. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 32(4), pp.942—967. [Abstract](#).

Analyzes specific case of food policy implementation by a municipal government, while also advancing research on how similar cross-cutting social and environmental issues are implemented by local governments elsewhere.

**A:** Packer, M.M. (2014). Civil Subversion: Making “quiet revolution” with the Rhode Island Food Policy Council. *Journal of Critical Thought and Praxis*, 3(1: article 6). [Open-access](#).

Drawing primarily from civic engagement and community organizing scholarship, this paper explores the Rhode Island Food Policy Council’s capacity to achieve food justice in light of its participatory, democratic potential.

**A:** Raja, S., Picard, D., Baek, S., & Delgado, C. (2014). Rustbelt radicalism: A decade of food systems planning in Buffalo, New York. *Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems, and Community Development*, 4(4), pp.173—189. [Abstract](#). [Policy brief](#).

Demonstrates that incremental, persistent food systems practice and advocacy by nonstate actors, a group called the “rustbelt radicals,” followed by their collective engagement with municipal planning, can lead to transformations in municipal policy and planning for strengthening food systems.

**\*\*R:** Raja, S. (ed.)(2016—In progress). Exploring Stories of Opportunity Series. Growing Food Connections Project. [Open-access](#).

A series of case studies exploring how communities of opportunity—places with significant potential to strengthen ties between small and medium-sized farms and residents with limited food access—are overcoming barriers to strengthen their food systems through planning, policy, and partnerships. Written briefs are completed for [Chautauqua County, NY](#) and [Wyandotte County, KA](#).

**A:** Santo, R., Yong, R. and Palmer, A. (2014). Collaboration meets opportunity: The Baltimore Food Policy Initiative. *Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems, and Community Development*, 4, pp.193—208. [Abstract](#). [Open-access research brief](#).

Highlights how one midsized city successfully developed a collaborative infrastructure to understand and address inequity in healthy food access. Traces the genesis and evolution of Baltimore’s Food Policy Task Force; the hiring of a food policy director; and the establishment of Baltimore Food Policy Initiative, an intergovernmental partnership to increase access to healthy, affordable foods in urban food deserts.

**D:** Smith, K.C. (2008). *The Lane County Food Policy Council and Re-framing Food Security* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon). [Open-access](#).

Investigates the political, cultural and historical contexts of Lane County, Oregon’s food system and assesses how food security is re-framed at the local level as community food security.

**\*\*A:** Whittaker, J., Clark, J.K., and Raja, S. (In progress). Rethinking rural food systems governance: The case of Cass County. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*.

Results of a national planning survey are reported that, at first glance, show rural local governments not involved in food systems planning. A case of a food policy council in Cass County, Iowa, counteracts these findings and suggests a rethinking of rural local government’s role in food systems governance.

## **Europe**

**A:** Balázs, B. (2012). Local food system development in Hungary. *International Journal of Sociology of Agriculture and Food*, 19(3), pp.403—421. [Open-access](#).

Documents the founding of Gödöllő Local Food Council in Hungary, discussing various specificities and challenges of new types of emerging urban civic food networks. Personal communication with author indicated that this council has since become inactive.

**B:** Bottiglieri, M., Pettenati, G., and Toldo, A. (eds.)(2016). *Toward the Turin Food Policy: Good practices and visions*. Food Smart Cities for Development. Milan, Italy: FrancoAngeli. [Open-access](#).

Discusses the actors and processes involved in the development of an integrated food governance system in Turin, Italy.

**A:** Moragues-Faus, A., and Morgan, K. (2015). Reframing the foodscape: The emergent world of urban food policy. *Environment and Planning A*, 47(7), pp.1558—1573. [Open-access](#).

Draws on urban political ecology scholarship as a critical lens to analyze governance-beyond-the-state processes and associated post-political configurations. Documents the founding and evolution of the Bristol Food Policy Council in England as one of its case studies.

**M:** Reed, M., and Keech, D. (2015). Building a Bristol Food City Region from the grass roots up: Food strategies, action plans and food policy councils. *Urban Agriculture Magazine*, 29, pp.26—29. [Open-access](#).

Highlights two case studies of innovative and multifunctional initiatives in Bristol, England, analyzing how grass-roots networks have attempted to influence food policy in the city.

**B:** Stierand, P. (2012). Food policy councils: Recovering the local level in food policy. In Viljoen, A. and Wiskerke, J.S. (eds.), 2012. *Sustainable Food Planning: Evolving Theory and Practice*. Wageningen Academic Pub, pp.67—78. [Abstract](#).

Provides a case study of the Brighton & Hove Food Partnership in England, offering it as an example of how food policy councils offer a viable possibility to recover the local level in food policy.

**\*\*P:** Walthall, B. (In progress). Stirring the pot: Civic actions for a more sustainable food system in contemporary Berlin. [Summary](#).

Develops a conceptual framework for assessing the role and contribution of civil society actors in shaping more sustainable urban food systems. Theorizes the emergence of a food council (Ernährungsrat) in Berlin.

### **Other and/or multiple continents**

**B:** Deakin, M., Diamantini, D., and Borrelli, N. (eds.) (2016). *The Governance of City Food Systems: Case Studies from Around the World*. Milan: Fondazione Giangiacomo Feltrinelli. [Open-access](#).

Provides eight case studies on the governance of city food systems in Milan, Belo Horizonte, Vancouver, Edinburgh, Bristol, Bangkok, Jakarta and Singapore. A number of these cities employ stakeholder coalition/council models in their food governance schemes.

**R:** Forster, T., Egal, F., Henk Renting, H., Dubbeling, M., and Escudero, A.G. (eds.) (2015). *Milan Urban Food Policy Pact: Selected Good Practices from Cities*. Milan: Fondazione Giangiacomo Feltrinelli. [Open-access](#).

Collects a number of best practices from signatory cities of the Milan Urban Food Policy Pact that have been successfully working on strategic goals, such as healthy nutrition for all and a careful management of resources in order to avoid food waste. Includes case studies of food policy councils in Ghent, Belgium and Toronto, Canada as well as food policy committees and similar groups in other countries.

**A:** Webb, K., Hawe, P., Noort, M. (2001). Collaborative Intersectoral Approaches to Nutrition in a Community on the Urban Fringe. *Health Education and Behavior*, 28, pp.306—319. [Open-access](#).

Describes the 10-year evolution of a local intersectoral project, Penrith Food Project in Australia, aimed at improving components of a community's food system as an approach to improving nutrition. Aspects of innovation and good contemporary practice in collaborating for health promotion are illustrated.

## Research on evaluating the impacts of individual FPGs

---

**A:** Calancie, L., Allen, N.E., Weiner, B.J., Ng, S.W., Ward, D.S., and Ammerman, A. (2017). Food policy council self-assessment tool: Development, testing, and results. *Preventing Chronic Disease*, 14(E), p.160281

This study describes the development, testing, and findings from the Food Policy Council Self-Assessment Tool (FPC-SAT). FPCs and those who work with them can use the assessment tool to determine strengths and areas for improvement related to FPCs' internal function. Additionally, the assessment tool could also be used to measure change in internal council function before and after a capacity-building or technical assistance intervention.

**\*\*A:** Calancie, L., Allen, N., Ammerman, A., Ward, D., Ng, S.W., Weiner, B.J. and Ware, W. (In review). Evaluating food policy councils using structural equation modeling. *Journal of Program Planning and Evaluation*.

This study tested a mechanism, the food Food Policy Council (FPC) Framework, to explain how councils function to influence their food system. The mechanism was adapted from a parsimonious community collaborative model empirically tested by Allen and colleagues (Allen, Javdani, Lehrner, & Walden, 2012). Using data collected from the Food Policy Council Self-Assessment Tool, the FPC Framework was tested using structural equation modeling. Results indicate that the FPC Framework can be used to explain FPC function and guide FPCs as they work toward their communities' specific food system goals.

**\*\*B:** Clark, J., Marquis, C., and Raja, S. (In press). "The local food policy audit: Spanning the civic-political agrifood divide." In *Nourishing Communities: Sustainable food system transformation through theory, practice and policy*, edited by A. Blay-Palmer, I. Knezevic, C. Levkoe, P. Mount and E. Nelson. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Using the case of the Franklin County Food Policy Council in Ohio, this chapter presents the local food policy audit as a coalition building process to be used by food policy councils that can take a civically-oriented group and transition them and their collaborators to an advocacy coalition. The audit, as a technical document, provides the basis of strategy development for policy change and is the "glue" that holds coalition efforts together.

**\*\*A:** Clark, J. (In review). From civic group to advocacy coalition: How a food policy audit became the tool for change. *Local Government Studies*.

Uses the case of a local food policy council to illustrate how a coalition increased local governance capacity via translating their commonly held beliefs into a concrete policy agenda while building their coalition along the way. A policy audit was used as a tool to develop technical knowledge (and skills) to increase policy readiness.

**\*\*B:** Marquis, C., and Clark, J. (In progress). “Turning deficit into democracy: The value of food policy audits in assessing and transforming local food systems.” In *From Farm-to-Fork: Growing Sustainable Food Systems for the 21st Century*. Akron, OH: University of Akron.

Many tools exist to assess various aspects of local food systems, but few are able to provide such a comprehensive snapshot of gaps and opportunities as the Food Policy Audit.

**R:** Prosperi, P., Moragues-Faus, A., Sonnino, R., and Devereux, C. (2015). *Measuring progress towards sustainable food cities: Sustainability and food security indicators*. Report of the ESRC financed Project “Enhancing the Impact of Sustainable Urban Food Strategies.” [Open-access](#).

This review of both academic and “grey” literature identifies the approaches currently used to assess sustainable food systems and urban spaces as well as the range of indicators used to measure the environmental, social and economic sustainability of urban food strategies.

**A:** Webb, K., Pelletier, D., Maretzki, A., Wilkins, J. (1998). Local food policy coalitions: Evaluation issues as seen by academics, project organizers, and funders. *Agriculture and Human Values*, 15, pp.65—75. [Open-access](#).

Although a number of pioneer coalitions have been formed in North America, Europe, and Australia with the goal of improving community food security and promoting sustainable local food systems, there has been little systematic evaluation of these models. This qualitative study was conducted to identify factors that may hinder evaluation efforts.

### **Evaluation tools for FPGs**

**R:** Moragues-Faus, A., Marceau, A., and Andrews, T. (2016). *Making the case and measuring progress: towards a systems approach to healthy and sustainable food*. Report of the ESRC financed Project “Enhancing the Impact of Sustainable Urban Food Strategies”. [Open-access](#).

This toolbox for action aims to 1) provide local authorities and policy makers with a clear, robust and comprehensive collation of relevant evidence and indicators of success of a place-based approach to food; and 2) help both existing and interested ‘practitioners’ to plan, implement, monitor and evaluate the impact of local cross-sector food partnerships.

**\*\*R:** Palmer, A., and Calancie, L. (2017). *Get it Together: Assessing Your Food Council’s Ability to Do Policy*. Johns Hopkins Center for a Livable Future, Bloomberg School of Public Health.

Adapted from the Alliance for Justice’s Bolder Advocacy Toolkit, this toolkit helps food councils to evaluate their current performance and learn more about the process of working on food policy using a stakeholder model. It also provides recommendations for resources that can hasten progress in a particular area.

## Research comparing *multiple* FPGs

---

The following articles compare the structures, issues, and activities of multiple FPGs.

### **North America**

**R:** Biehler, D., Fisher, A., Siedenbug, K., Winne, M., and Zachary, I. (1999). *Getting Food on the Table: An Action Guide to Local Food Policy*. Community Food Security Coalition & California Sustainable Agriculture Working Group. [Open-access](#).

This guidebook is designed to support local efforts to promote community food security by helping others to understand the breadth of policies affecting local food systems, evaluate policy barriers and opportunities, develop innovative solutions, and identify useful resources.

**A:** Blackmar, J. M. (2014). Deliberative democracy, civic engagement and food policy councils. *Rivista di Studi Sulla Sostenibilita*, 2, pp.43–57. [Abstract](#).

Explores five county/city food policy councils (FPCs) in the U.S. through the lens of deliberative democracy. In particular, it examines the questions of representation, inclusivity, and diversity of FPCs.

**\*\*D:** Boden, S., and Hoover, B. (In progress). Food policy councils in the Mid-Atlantic: Working towards justice.

Researchers from Messiah College conducting a research project looking at three different food policy councils in the Mid-Atlantic region to understand the relationship between the structure of food policy councils and their emphasis on food justice.

**R:** Borron, S. (2003). *Food policy councils: Practice and possibility*. Congressional Hunger Center. [Open-access](#).

Details food policy council basics and profiles some early food policy councils.

**B:** Clancy, K., Hammer, J., and Lippoldt, D. (2007). Food policy councils: Past, present and future. In C. C. Hinrichs & T. A. Lyson (Eds.), *Remaking the North American Food System: Strategies for Sustainability* (pp. 121–143). Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press.

Reviews the history and performance of government-sanctioned food policy councils (FPCs) with a minimum three-year history of operation in North America. Cases examined include a range of FPCs—enduring, foundering and failed. Lessons around what has worked and what has not, as well as to unintended and unintended outcomes are explored.

**P:** Clancy, K. (1988). Eight elements critical to the success of food system councils. Presented at Cornell Nutrition Update. [Open-access](#).

Part of a speech titled “Local Food Councils: A New Tool for Community Health.” Compiles key elements that contribute to the success of food system councils: official sanction, staff, funding, external legitimacy, knowledge base, power-sharing, vision, and leadership.

**A:** Clayton, M.L., Frattaroli, S., Palmer, A. and Pollack, K.M. (2015). The role of partnerships in US food policy council policy activities. *PloS one*, 10(4), p.e0122870. [Open-access](#).

Investigates the role of partnerships in food systems policy change through interviews with 12 purposefully selected food policy councils in the U.S. and 6 additional food policy experts.

**\*\*A:** Clark, J.K. (In review). Social equity and public participation design. *Public Administration Review*.

Using data drawn from eight county government food policy steering committees, this research finds that designers of public participation opportunities—who determine who participates, how and to what end—are not neutral parties. Their political efficacy and ability to be reflexive affect the strategies they adopt to engage community members. Recommendations are offered.

**P:** Dahlberg, K. (1994, June). Food Policy Councils: The experience of five cities and one county. In *Joint Meeting of the Agriculture Food and Human Values Society and the Association for the Study of Food and Society, Tucson, AZ*. [Open-access](#).

Analyzes the various factors that have influenced the successes or failures of food policy councils in five cities and one county, and provides a brief overall comparison of their effectiveness.

**R:** Hatfield, M.M. (2012). *City food policy and programs: Lessons harvested from an emerging field*. City of Portland, Oregon Bureau of Planning and Sustainability. [Open-access](#).

Few resources are available to local governments interested in developing a food policy program: best practices for organizing, funding, and supporting food systems work have been neither established nor publicized. Drawing on interviews with municipal food policy professionals, this report identifies common challenges for municipal food programs as well as avenues for addressing them.

**D:** Schiff, R. (2007). *Food Policy Councils: An examination of organisational structure, process, and contribution to alternative food movements* (Doctoral dissertation, Murdoch University). [Open-access](#).

Utilizing organizational theory and literature dealing with evaluation of collaborative, inter-agency organizations, this dissertation studies the organizational role of food policy councils, and proposes methods for effective structure and operation.

**A:** Schiff, R. (2008). The role of food policy councils in developing sustainable food systems. *Journal of Hunger & Environmental Nutrition*, 3(2-3), pp.206—228. [Open-access](#).

Analyzes the role of 13 food policy councils in the U.S. and Canada in relation to government, policy change, facilitation, networking, and education. It also explores the tension between policy and programmatic work.

**A:** Scherb, A., Palmer, A., Frattaroli, S. and Pollack, K. (2012). Exploring food system policy: A survey of food policy councils in the United States. *Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems, and Community Development*, 2(4), pp.3—14. [Abstract](#).

Analyzes survey responses of 56 food policy council (FPC) leaders to learn how FPCs engage in policy processes, the scope of their activities, and the impacts of their work.

**R:** Shapiro, L., Hoey, L., Colasanti, K., and Savas., S.A. (2015). *You can't rush the process: Collective impact models of food systems change*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Center for Regional Food Systems. [Open-access](#).

Highlights a range of state and multi-state food system initiatives across the country and explores six cross-cutting themes. Key strategies, indicators and lessons learned are shared for each initiative.

**A:** Siddiki, S.N., Carboni, J.L., Koski, C., & Sadiq, A. (2015). How policy rules shape the structure and performance of collaborative governance arrangements. *Public Administration Review*, 75(4), pp.536—547. [Abstract](#).

Explores how policies structure the stakeholder composition and goals of food policy councils (FPCs) and how FPCs' stakeholder composition facilitates and/or impedes their performance.

**R:** Union of Concerned Scientists (2016). *Fixing food: Fresh solutions from five U.S. cities*. Washington, DC: UCS. [Open-access](#).

Looks at how local governments and community groups in Baltimore, Louisville, Memphis, Minneapolis and Oakland are working to make affordable, healthy food available to more people and empower them to build better food systems.

## **Europe**

**D:** Halliday, J.J. (2015). *A New Institutional Analysis of Local Level Food Policy in England between 2012 and 2014* (Doctoral dissertation, City University London). [Open-access](#).

Assesses how institutional norms, values and practices affect the capacity of food policy groups in England to pursue their aims. Case studies explored in depth include the London Food Programme; the Islington Food Strategy; the Bristol Food Policy Council; Manchester Food Futures; and the County Durham Sustainable Local Food Strategy.

**A:** Lang, T., Rayner, G., Rayner, M., Barling, D., and Millstone, E. (2004). Discussion paper: Policy Councils on food, nutrition and physical activity: the UK as a case study. *Public Health Nutrition*, 8(1), pp.11–19. [Open-access](#).

The case for creating a food policy council in the UK is reviewed, as are possible organizational options, functions and remit.

**R:** Moragues-Faus, A., Morgan, K., Moschitz, H., Neimane, I., Nilsson, H., Pinto, M., Rohrer, H., Ruiz, R., Thuswald, M., Tisenkopfs, T., and Halliday, J. (2013). *Urban food strategies: The rough guide to sustainable food systems*. Document developed in the framework of the FP7 project FOODLINKS (GA No. 265287). [Open-access](#).

Collects visions and goals from urban food strategies (UFS) across Europe, and shows how they are translated into practices, instruments and actions. Compiles measures and highlights some good practices from cities that are already implementing their UFS in order to inspire other cities.

**A:** Moragues-Faus, A. (2015). Cambiar la política alimentaria empezando desde abajo (“Changing food policy from the bottom up”). *Soberanía Alimentaria, Biodiversidad y Culturas*, 19. [Open-access](#) (full article in Spanish).

Reflects on how municipalities can support food systems change and food sovereignty through the creation of new spaces for deliberation and participation. Includes specific examples of the Bristol Food Policy Council and Brighton & Hove Food Partnership.

**\*\*B:** Moragues-Faus, A. (2017). “Urban food policy alliances as paths to food sovereignty? Insights from sustainable food cities in the UK.” In Desmarais, A.A., Claeys, P., and Trauger, A. (eds.), 2017. *Public Policies for Food Sovereignty: Social Movements and the State*. Routledge, 2017.

This chapter draws attention to the value of building new alliances between local authorities and the public in the United Kingdom while also pointing out the challenges to developing a truly inclusive food system. It mobilizes political ecology approaches, the post-political scholarship and participative justice debates to examine key tensions arising in these food policy alliances to achieve food sovereignty.

**\*\*R:** Moragues-Faus, A. (2017). Los Consejos Alimentarios: Una herramienta municipalista para la transformación del sistema alimentario (“Food Councils: A municipal tool for the transformation of the food system”). *Soberanía Alimentaria, Biodiversidad y Culturas*.

Guide to food policy councils in Spanish.

## Research on FPG movement and/or how FPGs connect with one another

---

### **State or regional level**

\*\* Clark, J. et al. (In progress). Ohio Food Policy Network: Mapping the vision for the future of Ohio's food system. [Website](#).

A broad project aimed to create a shared agenda for Ohio's food system while establishing a resilient network. Seeks to 1) evaluate existing network relationships via a network analysis; 2) identify and map shared areas of research and practice illustrating linkages; 3) facilitate a robust dialogue around the shared values to reinforce linkages; and 4) provide a platform for collective action and roadmap to identify opportunities to leverage additional resources.

**R:** Harden, N., Heim, S., and Bain, J. (2015). *Cultivating Collective Action: The Ecology of a Statewide Food Network*. St. Paul, MN: Health and Nutrition, University of Minnesota Extension. [Open-access](#).

Explores opportunities and challenges faced by 13 statewide and two multi-state food networks in order to foster and grow the emerging statewide network of local food networks/councils in Minnesota.

**R:** Harden, N., Bain, J., and Heim, S. (2017). Convening of food network leaders evaluation. St. Paul, MN: University of Minnesota Extension. [Summary](#). [Unedited survey results](#).

Highlights feedback from a convention aimed to support, connect, and build capacity of food networks to contribute to the implementation of the Minnesota Food Charter. An example of how different scales of food policy groups are interacting with each other in one state.

\*\* Palmer, A. (In progress). Social network analysis of Chesapeake region network of food policy leaders.

Conducting longitudinal assessment of how the Chesapeake Food Policy Leadership Institute has helped to build a network of leaders of local food policy groups in the Chesapeake (MD, PA, DC, VA, DE) region, and the effects or potential effects of those relationships.

**R:** Rehmann, M. and Colasanti, K. (2014). *Advancing a Local Food Council Network in Michigan*. Michigan State University Center for Regional Food Systems. [Open-access](#).

Examines the potential for developing a statewide network of local food policy councils and similar groups in Michigan. Also demonstrates ways a local food council network and participating councils can advance Michigan Good Food Charter goals without duplicating the efforts of other local food networks.

\*\*Schroeder, A. (In progress). Coordination and collaboration between groups and programs working toward building healthy food systems in Wisconsin: Interviews among key informants.

Master's capstone research on key informants working on creating/promoting a healthy food system in Wisconsin. Seeking to identify the work being done, understand the perceived need for collaboration/coordination, and identify strategies to improve collaboration/communication.

### **National level**

**\*\*A:** Calancie, L., Cooksey Stowers, K., Palmer, A., Calhoun, H., Frost, N., Piner, A., and Webb, K. (In progress). Policy, systems, and environmental-level actions reported by food policy councils and intended impacts domains.

The variety of topics that FPCs address makes it challenging to describe the impacts FPCs have on their communities. This article is based on content analysis of a survey conducted with 66 FPCs from across North America. Six broad domains of impacts emerged: increasing access to healthy foods, increasing knowledge of or demand for healthy foods, promoting equity in the food system, supporting economic development, promoting environmental sustainability, and supporting a resilient food system.

**A:** Feenstra, G.W. (1997). Local food systems and sustainable communities. *American Journal of Alternative Agriculture*, 12, pp.28—36. [Abstract](#).

Reviews the existing literature on local food systems, examining a variety of strategies and initiatives including early food policy councils.

**\*\*A:** Irish, A., Clark, J., Bassarab, K., Palmer, A., and Santo, R. (In progress). Food policy growth and evolution: Evaluating development of roles and objectives of U.S. food councils over time.

Using annual survey data of food policy councils (FPCs) over the past four years, provides a theoretical framework for understanding the institutional forces that impact the formation and evolution of FPCs.

**R:** MacRae, R. and Donahue, K. (2013). *Municipal Food Policy Entrepreneurs: A Preliminary Analysis of How Canadian Cities and Regional Districts are Involved in Food System Change*. Toronto, CA: Toronto Food Policy Council, Vancouver Food Policy Council, CAPI. [Open-access](#).

Analyzes the results of a cross-Canada survey that found 64 local and regional municipalities working to improve the food system through a mix of municipal policies, programs and civil-society interventions. Describes six forms of food policy group organization, and includes brief highlights from food policy groups in Central Okanagan, Edmonton, Hamilton, Kaslo, Ottawa, Toronto, and Vancouver.

**B:** Mooney, P.H., Tanaka, K., and Ciciurkaite, G. (2014). Food policy council movement in North America: A convergence of alternative local agrifood interests?, in Constance, D.H. Renard, M., Rivera-Ferre, M.G. (eds.) *Alternative Agrifood Movements: Patterns of Convergence and Divergence (Research in Rural Sociology and Development, Volume 21)*. Emerald Group Publishing Limited, pp.229—255. [Abstract](#).

Explores the diffusion of the food policy council movement in North America, considers its variable linkages between state and civil society, and examines the substantive practices and framings in which the movement has been engaged.

**R:** Moragues-Faus, A., Adlerova, B., and Hausmanova, T. (2016). “Local” Level Analysis of FNS Pathways in the UK. Exploring two case studies: Sustainable Food Cities Network and access to fruit and vegetables in the city. TRANSMANGO: EU KBBE.2013.2.5-01 Grant agreement no: 613532. [Open-access](#).

Provides insights into local transition pathways in the European food and nutrition security (FNS) landscape by exploring practices that aim to build self-reliance and alleviate FNS vulnerabilities. Includes case study analysis of the Sustainable Food Cities Network, which connects food partnerships throughout the UK with the goal of scaling urban food strategies up and out in a national context.

**\*\*B:** Raja, S., Raj, S., and Roberts, B. (In press). “The US experience in planning for community food systems: An era of advocacy, awareness, and (some) learning.” In *Nourishing Communities: Sustainable food system transformation through theory, practice and policy*, edited by A. Blay-Palmer, I. Knezevic, C. Levkoe, P. Mount and E. Nelson. Springer.

Describes the extent to which local, regional, and metropolitan (LRM) governments are planning for stronger community food systems. Although a growing number of LRM are engaged in food work, planning for food systems remains far from mainstream planning practice.

**P:** Sheingate, A. (2015). Institutional unraveling? The new politics of food in the United States. Paper prepared for the Annual meeting of the Western Political Science Association, April 2.

Explores how the unraveling of the federal food/agricultural policy regime, exemplified by the last Farm Bill debacle, has created space for local and regional alternative food governance innovations such as food policy councils.

**R:** Sussman, L., and Bassarab, K. (2017). *2016 Food Policy Council Report*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Center for a Livable Future. [Open-access](#).

Summarizes the results of the 2016 Food Policy Council (FPC) survey, conducted annually since 2013 on trends among FPCs across the U.S. and Canada. The report also highlights innovative features of the All Things Food Community Food Network in Canada, Bloomington FPC, Del Norte County and Adjacent Tribal Lands Community Food Council, Florida FPC, Lehigh Valley FPC, and Rhode Island FPC.

### **Multiple countries**

**B:** Hunt, A.R. (2015). *Civic Engagement in Food System Governance: A Comparative Perspective of American and British Local Food Movements*. Oxford: Routledge.

Compares the US and UK's *national* food movements and the policy frameworks they have advanced in relation to local, sustainable food from 1976 (US) or 1991 (UK) to 2013. Provides context on evolution of federal food and farm policies, programs, and advocacy priorities—including key funding sources for FPGs in both countries—but does not specifically describe FPGs.

**\*\*B:** Morgan, K., and Santo, R. (In progress). "The Rise of the Municipal Food Movement," In Kalfagianna, A., & Skordili, S. (eds.). *Short Food Supply Chains: Responses to the Agro-Food System Crisis*.

Explores the rise of the municipal food movement as one of the fastest growing social movements in the Global North. Argues that their multi-scalar and multi-functional perspective helps prevent municipal food movements from becoming inadvertent agents of green parochialism by highlighting the need to be globally engaged as well as locally embedded.

**D:** Santo, R. (2016). "Why aren't we thinking about this as less rigid...?": *Comparing US and UK trans-local networks of food policy councils and partnerships* (Master's thesis, Cardiff University School of Geography & Planning). [Abstract](#).

Little research has explored how local FPGs are (horizontally) connecting to each other to share knowledge, practices, and resources, nor how they are interacting (vertically) with other scales of food governance. This thesis explores the emerging phenomenon of trans-local networks of FPGs through analyzing the Sustainable Food Cities Network in the UK and Food Policy Networks project in the US.

## Research on activities/outcomes of work by FPGs

---

This literature focuses on specific planning activities of, or policy outcomes achieved by, the work of FPGs (at least in part). While a much broader and expanding literature exists on the rise of local and regional food system planning and governance, the resources documented below were highlighted because they incorporate research on FPGs in some way.

### **Food policy changes**

**R:** Broad Leib, E. (2012). *Good laws, good food: Putting local food policy to work for our communities*. Harvard Food Law and Policy Clinic. [Open-access](#).

**R:** Broad Leib, E. (2012). *Good laws, good food: Putting state food policy to work for our communities*. Harvard Food Law and Policy Clinic. [Open-access](#).

These guides provide a starting place for food policy councils to understand the basic legal concepts surrounding local and state food systems, develop a base of knowledge about the main policy areas, and discover examples and innovations from other cities and states.

**A:** Clark, J.K., Dugan, K. and Sharp, J. (2015). Agrifood system policy agenda and research domain. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 42, pp.112–122. [Abstract](#).

Describes and traces the emergence of the agrifood system policy agenda in the U.S. Includes a brief overview of governance innovations at the local and state level driven by food policy councils, networks and coalitions.

**R:** Essex, A., Shinkle, D., and Bridges, M. (2015). *Harvesting Healthier Options: State Legislative Trends in Local Foods 2012-2014*. Denver: National Conference of State Legislatures. [Open-access](#).

Describes state legislation in all 50 states enacted between 2012 and 2014 that aimed to strengthen various components of local food systems. Focuses on six policy areas with the most state legislative action: local food system approaches; farm to school; farmers' markets; community gardens and urban agriculture; healthy grocery retail; and food policy councils.

**B:** Goddeeris, L. and Hamm, M. (2013). Local Government Support for Food System Development: An Initial Scan of the Landscape. In *The Municipal Year Book*, Washington D.C.: International City/County Management Association. [Open-access](#).

Summarizes the results of the first comprehensive national study conducted of local governments' food-related activities. Demonstrates that local governments are using a diverse range of federal programs to fund food system development, although usage varies among agencies and programs.

**M:** Goddeeris, L. (2016). Food for thought: How and why local governments support local food systems. In *Local Government Review, Putting Research Into Practice*, Washington D.C.: International City/County Management Association. [Abstract](#).

Summarizes the results of a comprehensive national study conducted in 2015 of local governments' food-related activities. Affirms that local food systems provide fertile ground for local government innovation, regardless of community size, geography, or other community characteristics. Local government support for food systems can catalyze and complement actions of community partners.

**A:** Hamilton, N.D. (2002). Putting a face on our food: How state and local food policies can promote the new agriculture. *Drake Journal of Agricultural Law*, 7(2), pp.408—454. [Open-access](#).

Details the potential for state and local policies to advance progressive agricultural/food system reform.

**R:** Harper, A., Shattuck, A., Holt-Giménez, E., Alkon, A., and Lambrick, F. (2009). *Food Policy Councils: Lessons Learned*. Oakland, CA: Food First Institute for Food and Development Policy. [Open-access](#).

Details basic background on FPCs, their functions, potential for success and challenges. Includes examples of organizational structure models, notable successes, and common challenges from a number of FPCs throughout the U.S.

**R:** Kobayashi, M., Tyson, L., and Abi-Nader, J. (2010). *The Activities and Impacts of Community Food Projects*. USDA/NIFA. [Open-access](#). See also Indicators of Success series (updated reports on Community Food Project impacts): [2011](#), [2014](#), [2015](#).

Provides an overview of the activities and impacts of Community Food Projects which received funding from the Community Food Projects Competitive Grants Program, including food policy councils and networks.

**A:** McClintock, N.I., Wooten, H., Brown, A.E. (2012). Toward a food policy “first step” in Oakland, California: A food policy council’s efforts to promote urban agriculture zoning. *Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems and Community Development*, 2(4), pp.15—42. [Abstract](#).

Documents the efforts of the Oakland Food Policy Council to develop recommendations for urban agriculture (UA) zoning in Oakland, California, as a means of fostering UA’s expansion.

**A:** Muller, M., Tagtow, A., Roberts, S., MacDougall, E. (2009). Aligning food systems policies to advance public health. *Journal of Hunger and Environmental Nutrition*, 4(3-4), pp.225—240. [Open-access](#).

Encourages public health professionals to create unlikely alliances and get involved in policy development outside of their normal expertise such as by joining or supporting the development of food policy councils.

**M:** Raja, S., Diao, C., Whittaker, J., Campbell, M.C., and Bailkey, M. (2016). Community-led urban agriculture policy making: A view from the United States. *RUAF Urban Agriculture Magazine*, 31, pp. 18—24. [Open-access](#).

Discusses how community-led interest in urban agriculture, driven in part by food policy council activism, laid the groundwork for city government policy reform in Buffalo, NY and Madison, WI.

**R:** Burgan, M. and Winne, M. (2012). *Doing Food Policy Councils Right: A Guide to Development and Action*. Mark Winne Associates. [Open-access](#).

Offers practical tools to create and sustain effective food policy councils. Includes numerous examples of specific food policy and programmatic achievements by FPCs throughout the U.S.

### **Meaningful inclusion of diverse community members**

**\*\*D:** Gazillo, C. (In progress). Passing an urban agricultural zoning ordinance in Bridgeport, CT: A Case Study (Master's capstone, School for International Training Graduate Institute).

Exploring how the Bridgeport Food Policy Council can address issues of racial and class inequity in the design and implementation of a new zoning ordinance that will regulate and protect urban agriculture within the city.

**\*\*R:** Estabrook, B., Clark, J.K., Freedgood, J.F., and Raja, S. (In progress). Setting the table for all: Creating an equitable food system through inclusive civic engagement. Will be available at: <http://growingfoodconnections.org/publications/briefs/translating-research-for-policy/>.

Provides a background on social equity considerations for public participation and civic engagement as part of local governments and food policy coalition efforts. Using findings from a series of workshops conducted in eight communities across the country by the Growing Food Connections project, recommends steps for how coalitions can create social equity.

**D:** McCullagh, M. (2012). *Food policy for all: Inclusion of diverse community on food policy councils* (Master's thesis, Tufts University). [Abstract](#).

Explores how community residents who are most impacted by social inequities or who are most at risk for food insecurity are involved in food policy council (FPC) activities. Examples drawn from interviews with a variety of FPCs shed light on current efforts of inclusion and inspire suggestions for improvement.

**R:** McCullagh, M. and Santo, R. (eds.) (2014). *Food policy for all: Inclusion of diverse community on food policy councils*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Center for a Livable Future. [Open-access](#).

Summary report of thesis by McCullagh (2012).

**R:** Mutuma, B. (2014). *Detroit Food Policy Council: The Politics of Community Engagement: How to Involve Community in Needed Food Policy Reform*. Emerson Hunger Fellow, 2013-2014. [Open-access](#).

Involving those most impacted by our broken food system in meaningful and educational dialogue is essential to creating a more fortified community. This report offers strategies to increase engagement with community members in food policy decisions.

**A:** Purifoy, D.M. (2014). Food policy councils: Integrating food justice and environmental justice. *Duke Environmental Law & Policy Forum*, 24, pp.375—398. [Abstract](#).

Food policy councils (FPCs) that do not also make social justice central to their mission risk reproducing the same race and class inequalities in their advocacy and policy outcomes. This paper argues that in order to accomplish goals of ecological sustainability, food sustainability, and community food access, FPCs should adopt the principles of the environmental justice and food justice movements.

### **Food strategies and plans**

**R:** Hodgson, K. (2012). *Planning for Food Access and Community-Based Food Systems: A National Scan and Evaluation of Local Comprehensive and Sustainability Plans*. American Planning Association. [Open-access](#).

Results of a multiphase research study to identify and evaluate the development, adoption and implementation of food related goals and policies of local comprehensive plans, including sustainability plans, across the U.S. Assesses their impact on local policies, regulations, and standards for the purpose of reducing food access disparities and improving community-based food systems.

**\*\*A:** Mendes, W., and Sonnino, R. (In press). Urban food governance in the Global North. In *Handbook of Nature*. London: Sage.

Analyzes British and North American urban food strategy narratives, considering what these narratives tell us about the potential of sustainable food systems, the social movements that propel them, and the “deliberative spaces” (e.g., food councils) they create, to offer a powerful new pathway to urban sustainability.

**R:** Neuner, K., Kelly, S., and Raja, S. (2011). *Planning to eat? Innovative local governments plans and policies to build healthy food systems in the United States*. Buffalo, New York: University at Buffalo, The State University of New York. [Open-access](#).

Synthesizes recent best practices of local government policy and planning designed to strengthen community food systems.

**A:** Pothukuchi, K. and Kaufman, J.L. (1999). Placing the food system on the urban agenda: The role of municipal institutions in food systems planning. *Agriculture and Human Values*, 16(2), pp.213—224. [Open-access](#).

Examines existing or potential city institutions that could offer a more comprehensive look at the urban food system, include city departments of food, food policy councils, and city-planning departments.

**A:** Sonnino, R. (2014). The new geography of food security: Exploring the potential of urban food strategies. *The Geographical Journal*. [Open-access](#).

This documentary analysis of 15 urban food strategies from Canada, the USA and the UK explores the motivations behind cities’ perceived need to rescale food governance; the key concepts and ideas deployed to construct the underlying narrative of the strategies; and the role attributed to re-localisation in relation to food security and sustainability concerns.

### **Economic development**

Clark, J.K. and Inwood, S.M. (2016). Scaling-up regional fruit and vegetable distribution: Potential for adaptive change in the food system. *Agriculture and Human Values*, 33(3), pp.503—519.

There have been calls to ‘scale-up’ local food production to regionally distribute food and to sell into more mainstream grocery and retail venues. This research highlights the role a state-wide food policy council can have in facilitating market development and their unique position to provide public sector and institutional support to facilitate meaningful connections in the food system.

### **FPG engagement at the federal level**

**R:** Johns Hopkins Center for a Livable Future (2015). *Stories from the field: The role of local and state food policy councils in federal policy making and implementation*. Baltimore, MD. [Open-access](#).

Highlights the ways, using examples from throughout the U.S., in which local and state food policy councils can increase their understanding of the larger federal policy making process, bring local issues to the attention of Congress and federal agencies, increase the flow of federal resources to local communities, and educate and mobilize local communities about how federal policies and regulations affect them.

### **Funding FPGs**

**R:** Johns Hopkins Center for a Livable Future (2015). *Funding food policy councils: Stories from the field*. Baltimore, MD. [Open-access](#). [Associated webinar](#).

Obtaining adequate and consistent funding remains a continuous challenge for food policy councils (FPCs). Since FPCs exist at a variety of jurisdictional levels, and with a variety of organizational structures and priorities, there is no single model for successfully funding an FPC. This report describes the stories of how six city, county, and state FPCs across the U.S. have funded their efforts over their years of existence.

### **Relationships with other institutions (e.g. cooperative extension, universities)**

**A:** Fitzgerald, N. and Morgan, K. (2014). A food policy council guide for Extension professionals. *Journal of Extension*, 12(2). [Open-access](#).

Extension professionals can serve as “change agents,” bring a wealth of experience and knowledge, form cross-sectoral collaborations, take leadership roles, and build community capacity through food policy councils. Based on expert interviews and experiences in establishing a council, the authors present practice recommendations to serve as a concise how to guide for Extension professionals.

\*\*Kluson, R. (UF/IFAS Extension Sarasota County)(In progress). Conducting survey of FPGs involved with Local Cooperative Extension and/or Farm Bureau.

## Research gaps

---

### **Research on individual FPGs**

- More case studies of FPGs that have dissolved or failed to successfully organize around issues
- More in-depth investigations of contentious dynamics within groups (e.g. restaurants vs. labor unions, conventional vs. sustainable or small farmers, hunger alleviation vs. food access)
- Internal evaluations of FPG operations/projects
- Impact assessments of FPG activities on health, environmental, economic development, and/or social justice indicators
- Explorative studies of how FPGs have worked across political boundaries and/or scales
- Research on connections and/or comparative analyses with other social justice movements (e.g., climate justice, Black Lives Matter, anti-fracking, pipeline opposition, etc.)
- More research/guidance on how FPGs determine how to prioritize local vs. state vs. federal advocacy
- Research on how an FPG applies systems thinking to its work (e.g., employs knowledge of what's happening beyond local scale for its issues; incorporates systems tools into strategic and project planning as well as communications with politicians, media, and public)

### **Research comparing multiple FPGs**

- Deeper analysis of funding sources and implications for the scope of work that FPGs pursue and the relative attention they devote to different issue areas
- Studies assessing how FPGs employ/embody theories of change
- Research on how FPGs are utilizing available educational resources (e.g., community colleges, universities, etc.)
- Comparative evaluations of internal FPG operations/projects
- Comparative impact assessments of FPG activities on health, environmental, economic development, and/or social justice indicators
- Comparative research on the how an FPG's origin of establishment (e.g., founded by civic initiative, local government, or research institute) or organizational structure influence its policy and programmatic priorities, content, impact, or transformative quality

**Research on the FPG movement and/or how FPGs connect with one another**

- More research on how state and regional networks of FPGs operate and how local groups engage with them
- Further investigation into how national movement of FPGs is (or could be) influencing national and international level policy realm
- Assessment of how FPGs interact with international initiatives (e.g. Milan Food Policy Pact, C40 Food Systems Network)