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1.0 INTRODUCTION
The supply and availability of food has been a crucial factor shaping the emergence, development, and persistence of human civilizations. Food availability, pricing and safety have become prominent issues in recent years within local food systems (Godfray et al., 2010).

Advocates allege that local food improves the local economy by holding onto the food dollars through direct marketing, instils food safety and security issues since consumers know where their food is coming from, and sustains ecological integrity through distribution methods and sound farming practices (Duram and Oberholtzer, 2010). The values within these systems are usually rooted in, “environmental sustainability, social justice, organic production, support of local and regional farmers, as well as eating seasonally” (Duram and Oberholtzer, 2010).

Organizations such as the Waterloo Region Food System Roundtable (Roundtable), and Food Summit events are essential in creating awareness and priorities to guide regional governments decisions on curbing the future of local food development. However, it is important for third party actors to assess and re-evaluate the cohesion of the stakeholders involved along the food system chain from the producers, processors, distributors, retailers, and consumers (Roundtable, 2010). As the food system continues to develop in the Waterloo Region, there are more stakeholder groups and individuals interested in getting involved. Being efficient and cohesive in classifying and categorizing stakeholders becomes an important aspect of linking the needs and main components of the food system together.

The primary purpose of this research paper is to create a method of profiling and mapping the direct and indirect involvement of food system organizations within the Waterloo Region. This paper shall serve as a pilot study for the Roundtable where subsequent studies can elaborate on our methods to establish an efficient mapping system.

2.0 BACKGROUND OF FOOD SYSTEMS

2.1 A Glance at the Global Level
Issues around hunger, poverty, and sustainability are steadily increasing within the global food system. The problem around hunger is not so much a problem of supply as it is of affordability and distribution (Wiggins, 2008). This is especially true of individuals living in underdeveloped regions versus developed ones. The concept of industrialization began to take a new approach
around the 1950s when a large focus had been placed on mass production increasing food supply and availability to developed regions, which also happen to be wealthiest areas (Toronto Public Health, 2010). Regardless of the population growth occurring over the past 60 years, the agricultural sector has been producing adequate amounts of food for everyone (Toronto Public Health, 2010). If there is ample food production, then why are still hunger and sustainability issues? Ultimately what is occurring on the world markets is a rise in food prices. This in turn affects national and local food pricing, therefore reducing the access of food for those living in poverty, inhibiting them to sustain a healthy diet (Wiggins, 2008).

In taking a closer look at North America, since the mass production of food, the introduction of low-cost highly processed convenience foods have made their way to all supermarkets (Toronto Public Health, 2010). It is no surprise that there are hundreds of millions suffering from malnutrition in urban areas (Satterthwaite et al., 2010). This is due to the lack of accessibility to affordable healthy foods (Toronto Public Health, 2010). Based on the current nature of the world’s free market economic structure and the role of multinational corporations, there ends up being a large disconnect across the food system chain from the producers to the consumers. However, there is definite opportunity to strengthen those direct ties within the local food system (Hinrichs, 2000).

2.2 A Glance at the Local Level

Reviewing literature on a local scale showed much discussion and planning of future local food system schemes. It is clear through several Region of Waterloo and Public Health division documents that the local food system is not well connected and local products need support, which can be achieved through increasing local purchases and consumer awareness. Similarly, the solutions are generally broad statements that include ‘increasing food linkages, participating farmers, protecting Waterloo region’s farming environment, food sovereignty and creating strong economy’ (Xuereb, 2005; Region of Waterloo, 2005; Harry Cummings & Associates Inc., 2005; Miedema & Pigott, 2007). A few different tools in result of these solutions, proven to be useful, are the Buy Local! Buy Fresh! Map (Xuereb, 2005), as well as the tracing of local food to local store shelves (Harry Cummings & Associates Inc., 2005).

Vanadana Shiva offers similar suggestions, in an interview with Desjardins (2010), about the local food system but she also comments on going beyond information and the importance of community’s taking a stand, even rebelling for change in policies. Recognition by the Waterloo
Region for the lack of food system structure is helpful, but there are foreseeable challenges in the implementation of such broad solutions. There are more specific problems faced by the local food systems which include; the inability to develop a stable foundation within the food system chain, distribute in a broader range of markets, limited research, education and marketing training for producers along with food safety requirements (Toronto Public Health, 2010).

2.3 The Waterloo Region Food System Roundtable

The purpose of a food council or roundtable is to explore the dynamics of a food system for a particular area and understand how it is operating by examining all the different stakeholders involved, whereby the findings are used to develop recommendations for improvement (NAFPC, 2010). In 2007, the Waterloo Region Food System Roundtable (Roundtable) was established by the Region of Waterloo Public Health department to advocate for issues around sustaining a healthy local food system for the Waterloo Region (Roundtable, 2010). This organization serves as a collective body of representatives who are working to bridge together different topics, sectors, and stakeholders involved in the Region’s food system (Roundtable, 2010).

In an effort to steer the group, a Food Summit was held in Kitchener in 2009 to raise awareness of food issues around security and accessibility (Roundtable, 2010). The success of the Summit resulted in 13 initiatives that were compiled by the 140+ attendees as primary areas requiring immediate attention and/or change (Roundtable, 2010). By January 2010, those 13 initiatives, were amalgamated into six key priorities drawing on the importance of building a healthy local food system (Roundtable, 2010). Each priority is intertwined with the other; therefore one holds no precedence over the other. They collectively aim to combat issues of food security and access to a sufficient amount of nutritious food that has been produced in environmentally sustainable ways at an affordable cost for consumption (Roundtable, 2010). The following six priorities encompass a broad range of issues, and were established in this manner in order to withstand any changes that may occur within the food system over time.

1) Food Sovereignty: Removing transparencies and fulfilling the rights of all individuals to have more knowledge, involvement, and control over the type of food available in the region.

2) Food Policy: Advocating and monitoring the implementation for food policies at the three levels of government (local, provincial, and federal).
3) Urban Agriculture: Promoting food growth in urban areas by local people to provide them with control and access to the type of food they wish to consume.

4) Local Food Infrastructure: Rebuilding the community infrastructure to enable local processors and distributors to improve the availability of their foods for local residents.

5) Farm Viability: Advocating for initiatives and policies around helping small and large scale farmers earn profits for their food, and encouraging healthy food production for local sale.

6) Access to Healthy Food: Pursue policies and initiatives that guarantee all individuals to have adequate access to healthy food (affordable, less distance needed to travel, and culturally acceptable) (Roundtable, 2010).

3.0 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES
The goal of this report is to serve as a pilot study for the Roundtable to help them establish an efficient method for profiling and mapping the involvement of food system organizations within the Waterloo Region. Within any food system it is necessary to clearly understand the involved organizations, the varying levels of stakeholder types, and the linkages between them. The ability to map this food system will enable the exploration of overarching problems around improving the availability and access of local food to consumers. The following objectives were established for research purposes:

1) Create a profile of representative organizations within the producer-consumer chain that are involved with the development, promotion, education, and awareness of building a sustainable food system in the Waterloo Region.

2) Understand the direct and indirect involvement of the organizations according to the Roundtable initiatives and stakeholder groups.

3) To analyse effectiveness of the templates and whether they can be successfully used to begin mapping the Waterloo Region’s food system.
4.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

There were several steps involved addressing the aforementioned objectives outlined in the previous section. This section will explain the rationale behind the structure of this research and the type of data that was used.

Outlining Operational Definitions

For this report the general working definition of ‘local food systems’ was adopted from the University of California’s Sustainable Agricultural Research and Education Program meaning, “a partnership of farmers, consumers, and communities to create a more locally based, self-reliant food economy, while integrating sustainable food production, processing, distribution, and consumption in order to enhance the environmental, economic and social health of a particular place” (2006). In reviewing other literature, the term ‘local’ does not have a precise geographic delineation, as there are many ways to define the area (Duram and Oberholtzer, 2010). In regards to this research, ‘local’ has been defined as the official regional boundaries that make up the Municipality of Waterloo. It encompasses Waterloo, Kitchener, Wilmot, North Dumfries, Cambridge, Wellesley, and Woolwich (Region of Waterloo, 2010).

Identifying the Stakeholders

Being a pilot study, the scope of this research is limited to seven organizations (listed in Section 5.1), because they serve as a representation of other similar organizations within the Region.

Generating a Profiling Table

A table is created to profile specific aspects of the stakeholders and includes: when they were established, their purpose, structure and main functions, all of which help to categorize them for further analyses.

Data Collection

Information for the profiling is primarily collected through online websites, podcasts of interviews and journal or newspaper articles.

In order to gain further insight, several of these stakeholders were contacted through e-mail and phone surveys to understand the complex barriers they encounter and foreseeable development or changes they anticipate. Two semi-structured interviews were successfully held with non-profit organizations, Canadian Organic Growers and The Community Gardening.
Creating the Templates
The collected data is used to create templates in order to layout where these organizations lie within the food system. A primary template will be created to serve as an inventory of organizations grouped accordingly to their direct and indirect involvement with the six initiatives set forth by the Roundtable. This will aid in assessing how they coincide/interact/apply to each other; whether they are directly or indirectly involved, need support, or not involved to a particular priority. These four categories have been defined in Section 5.3.

This shall be followed by the creation of a secondary template that will identify which stakeholder group the organizations belong to and whether they have a direct or indirect role. This will help further the mapping process by determining the organizations involvement in the food system as a producer, processor, distributor, retailer, consumer, and/or educator. While there are many more stakeholder groups outlined by the Roundtable, this study focus’ on the six aforementioned groups, which have been defined in Section 5.4.

5.0 FINDINGS AND ANALYSES

5.1 Profile of Organizations
For this study, the following seven organizations were focused on for profiling: Canadian Gardening Council (CGC), Canadian Organic Growers (COG), Foodlink, Local Organic Food Team (LOFT), Waterloo Federation of Agriculture, and The Working Centre.

To begin with the mapping process, it is necessary to determine what proportion of organizations work within the various sectors of the economy. The two most common known sectors are public and private, however upon a review of Canada’s economic structure; a third sector referred to ‘social economy’ was discovered. Human Resources and Skills Development of Canada (2005) defined it as, “a grass-roots entrepreneurial, not-for-profit sector, based on democratic values that seeks to enhance the social, economic, and environmental conditions of communities, often with a focus on their disadvantaged members.” The economic boundaries of this research were then altered to accommodate the third sector considering six of the eight organizations profiled in this study fall under the non-profit category. The BALTA report (2006)
addressed other groups that could fall under social economy such as, co-operatives, volunteer organisations, foundations, and charities.

![Diagram](image.png)

**Figure 1**: Economic Boundaries of Food System Organizations

The white spaces that were left in between the sectors are for any organizations that may overlap with one another. For example, a think tank (research group) or university could potentially fall under both the public and private sector, or an organization may donate funds to certain non-profits therefore creating a cross between either the public or private sector with the social economy.

The eight organizations were placed within **Figure 1** solely for visual representation of where they stand. Please refer to **APPENDIX A** for the profiling table that highlights each organization: name, type of sector, purpose, structure, and function. This table serves as a
layout for building a database of all the food system stakeholders within the Waterloo Region.

5.2 Interview Results
Individual barriers were identified by CGC and COG, the two non-profit organizations that were interviewed. COG was established approximately 20 years before CGC. They currently operate at a larger scale than CGC in regards to the amount of manpower, promotional materials to raise awareness (professional website, local events, and workshops) and nationwide recognition. However, they still manage to share a few common barriers that are inhibiting their growth and expansion within the Waterloo Region.

1. Lack of funding available to support members and hold events.
2. Lack of involvement at the municipal level.
3. Raising social justice around the importance of sustaining local healthy food systems.

It was anticipated that our interview would help us to understand the gaps within the Regions food system. Upon second glance of the responses it became clear that the interview process may be better suited at a later stage in the mapping process, as the scope of this study was intended to create a method for profiling the involvement of organizations. However, parts of the interviews were helpful in determining whether CGC or COG could use more support. For complete interview responses, please refer to APPENDIX B and C.

5.3 Framework Based on the Roundtable Priorities
The involvement of organizations according to the six Roundtable priorities is displayed in Table 1. Please note priorities identified by the Roundtable are priorities for the food system in the Waterloo Region. The purpose of this table is to understand how the organizations are operating and whether they have established goals and align themselves with the Roundtable priorities. Working definitions of the categorizing system below were determined based on profiling process discussed in Section 5.1.

Direct (D): indicates active involvement with the Roundtable priority based on an action that is carried out by organization that has been addressed in their goals, vision, or mandate.

Indirect (I): indicates active involvement based on an action that does not lie within the outlined purpose and function of the organization.
Need Support (NS): represents organizations that were seen as not being able to continue functioning efficiently without outside assistance. It was recognized that most organizations will require some degree of support; however NS was only applied to extreme situations.

Empty box: indicates that the organization is not involved with the particular priority.

Unclear (?): The stakeholder involvement is unclear and yet to be determined.

The following table is filled in according to the definitions set forth in Section 5.3. It is subject to change according to the Roundtable needs and definitions or understanding of the particular stakeholder roles, which could be different from the ones presented below. This research only serves as a pilot guide and thus is intended to be adapted for different purposes.

Table 1. Mapping Organizations According to Roundtable Priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roundtable Priorities</th>
<th>Food System Organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternatives Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Food Sovereignty</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Food Policy</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Urban Agriculture</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Local Food Infrastructure</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Farm Viability</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Access to Healthy Food</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Alternatives Journal**

Alternative Journal addresses issues in the form of peer-reviewed literature. Although they directly raise issues however, they are ‘indirectly active’ because hope is given that readers follow through and enforce change through action or further discussion of their topics published.

**COG**

COG provides instructional guides, booklets, documents, and workshops on how to help farmers and gardeners with organic farming practices. These main functions within the organization make them direct players in the selected priorities.
CGC
This organization fits well within the six priorities. Their initiatives of community gardening directly impact improving food sovereignty, urban agriculture, local food infrastructure, and access to healthy food. They are advocates for change in food policy; therefore they are indirectly involved as improvements in this area will allow them to expand their operations. Based on the interview that was conducted, it was indicated that they required immediate support in all areas they are directly involved in.

Foodlink
This organization is directly in sync with majority of the Roundtable priorities, as they are currently involved with providing different avenues for stakeholder groups to find out how to get access to local food.

LOFT
Loft is directly active in several areas. However, they also require general support to help promote and increase their initiatives in food sovereignty and local food infrastructure. Their work focuses on the grassroots level in the urban sector, as opposed to supporting urban agriculture or food policy, which they are not involved in. They are also directly involved with the access to healthy food by improving the direct link between producers and consumers. Their support for farm viability is an indirect action, as they current have no mandates that address improving the food dollars for farmers.

Waterloo Federation of Agriculture
The Waterloo Federation of Agriculture is directly active in food policy, local infrastructure, and farm viability as they advocate for issues around protecting the future of farmers within the Waterloo Region. Their support for farmers makes them indirectly active by promoting food sovereignty and access to healthy food.

The Working Centre
The Working Centre does not necessarily fit easily into the priority categories set forth by the Roundtable. However their functions are still important for the local food system. The Working Centre is only recognized as being directly active with food sovereignty and indirectly active with local food infrastructure, as well as access to healthy food.
5.4 Framework Based on the Roundtable Stakeholder Groups

The direct and indirect involvement of organizations according to the food system chain, is displayed in Table 2. Additional more specific stakeholder groups will be included as the pilot study expands, and will not be limited to these six categories: producer, processor, distributor, retailer, consumer, and educator. As noted in a Waterloo Region Food System Roundtable Nominations Committee Report (2010⁵), examples of these additional groups consist of emergency food providers, urban agriculture advocates, academics / researchers specializing in food systems issues, land use planners, restaurants and volunteers. Six categories of stakeholder groups are sufficient enough to gain a wide enough scope for the purposes of this research. The first four components of the food system chain have been adopted from Burton (2009), as:

1. Producer: involved with growing the crops and deciding when they are ready to be harvested.
2. Processor: involved with cleaning, separating, handling, and preparing the food item before being sold to the distributor.
3. Distributor: involved with storing the food until they are requested to transport it to a market.
4. Retailer: involved with selling the food to the consumer.

The remaining two were determined from compiling information on the Roundtable (2010⁵).

5. Consumer: is one who may purchase local food or grow food for their own consumption. The avenues provided to consumer for finding out where to purchase local food has a direct impact on them, regardless of whether or not they chose to use those avenues.

6. Educators: represents any type of academic, advocacy, research, or policy work, as well as organizations that host workshops and training sessions for farmers or consumers.
Table 2. Mapping Organizations According to their Involvement with Stakeholder Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Groups</th>
<th>Alternatives Journal</th>
<th>Canadian Organic Growers</th>
<th>Community Gardening Council</th>
<th>Foodlink</th>
<th>LOFT</th>
<th>Waterloo Federation of Agriculture</th>
<th>The Working Centre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Producers</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributors</td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retailers</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumers</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educators</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table can help determine where individuals with backgrounds of academic expertise, skilled trades or volunteer interest can be placed according to their strengths, coinciding with the previously identified ‘need support’ areas from Table 1. Table 2 should be used in conjunction with Table 1 as new members enter the Roundtable systems database. For example, someone interested in providing services to producers would be linked to that category where the direct involvement of an organization could be found by horizontally moving across Table 2, whereby the chosen organization would then be cross-referenced with their placement on Table 1. This would indicate whether they are involved with Roundtable initiatives and require assistance. This would also work in the reverse effect; movement from priority to stakeholder group and vice versa.

Alternatives Journal
Alternatives Journal is a direct educator due to their function as a magazine that addresses a wide range of environmental issues. As a result, they indirectly affect all of the other stakeholder groups depending on the type of material they publish.

COG
COG indirectly impacts the producer by providing information, training, and workshops on how to become a certified organic grower as a farmer or gardener, which is why they directly affect the educators groups. They also directly affect the retailer and consumer group by promoting restaurants that use locally grown organic food on their menu and creating a ‘Local Organic Farm Directory’ for individuals to use. They do not directly help with the physical growing process of the produce.
CGC
CGC directly affects the producer and consumer, as in most cases the consumers are helping with the production of the community gardens. A question mark was placed under the distribution group, because whether they impact this area is unclear. Community gardeners generally share food with family and friends and on occasion some of them will provide food to shelters, such as House of Friendship, which is an initiative that is not based on the influence of the council.

Foodlink
Foodlink directly affects the educators, consumers, and retailers by marketing and promoting local produce and providing maps for finding local produce in the community, recipes, information on food labelling, certifications etc. They indirectly affect the producer because they provide maps that link the consumer to the producer (buy local, buy fresh), and similarly to COG, they also do not help with the actual growing process.

LOFT
LOFT directly impacts the producers and distributors, because they are in charge of growing their own food and distributing it to drop off stations. They are also involved with selling their food to the consumer, thus directly involving them with the retail and consumer groups.

Waterloo Federation of Agriculture
The Waterloo Federation of Agriculture directly affects the producer and processor based on a long standing role of advocating farmers concerns to all levels of government. They are indirectly involved with distributing, because this is dependent on the farmers problems, which can include issues of distribution. They are directly involved in being an educator because of their involvement with policy work.

The Working Centre
The Working Centre directly affects consumer and retailer because they allow for people to come and sell their food at the centre. They provide the infrastructure for the selling to take place and they offer venues for consumers to purchase local food. The Working Centre is indirectly an educator, as they are leading by example. Their events can promote and advocate certain food issues, while also creating a good avenue to link the community together.
6.0 IMPLICATIONS OF THE FRAMEWORK
This section shall outline some of the implications that were found with this method of mapping food system organizations.

1. The economic boundaries involved with profiling will likely have to change once more organizations are added to the database, as there will be many unknowns that need to be addressed in terms of their operations. Confirmation is needed on whether each working sector has been defined accurately or are there more branches that need to be accounted for.

2. Anticipated problems with expanding the templates.
   a) There are many more stakeholder groups, but only six were focused on to simplify the study. The expansion may lead to problems in defining the groups and trying to figure out where to place certain organizations. For example, the ‘educators’ stakeholder group is currently very broad as it encompasses any type academic, advocacy, research, or policy work, as well as organizations that host workshops and training sessions for farmers or consumers.
   b) As well certain definitions may have to be reworked once more organizations are added to the tables, as problems arose with the distributor group in Table 2. If a consumer is involved with producing food (e.g. like CGC and The Hen Association), do they also fall under being a distributor? Perhaps the term distributor needs to be crossed referenced with other sources to determine what a market is. If food is being transported to a food bank and a supermarket, is it the same thing? Or would a market only refer to a place where a monetary transaction is made?

3. Once the mapping framework of this study is ready to progress to the next building stage, how would efficient data entry and retrieval of information be maintained?

4. Research design is critical to quality. Our surveys must be well designed and tested. There needs to be consistency in the approach we use to cover organizations across sectors to ensure data comparability is maximized for the mapping purposes.

5. Majority of the information that was gathered from the two interviews was not applicable to this stage of the pilot study. Instead, it would be advantageous to incorporate a short survey to discover the barriers and needs of the organizations, rather than conducting semi-structured
interviews. The survey could be used to better populate Table 1 by focusing on questions surrounding the Roundtable priorities. This would allow for a better understanding of the organizations that are experiencing limitations to expansion, such that their progress is halted. As it has been generally assumed that minimal support is required for each organization, the title of “needs support” should only be allocated for extreme situations where a third party involvement may be necessary to move forward. Overall, this could improve the functionality of the table by visually communicating where gaps/problems lie.

6. There is currently a lack of resources for referencing comparable mapping studies. The disconnect that has been occurring within the local food system over the last decade has not been enough time for cities or regions to address specific problems. There may however be certain areas working on a similar mapping process, but limited work has been published due to the amount of time it can take to test and establish an efficient system. That being said, this report is a work-in-progress.

7.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This tool of mapping the food systems from the perspective of the Roundtable considers the stakeholder groups and organizations from a different respect: organizing, linking similar stakeholder groups and types, as well as providing a brief insight to their position as a organization.

The mapping framework discussed in the report can be used as an essential stepping stone towards strengthening the foundation of the Waterloo Region food system. Current food mapping systems used in other regions or organizations will not necessarily encompass the particular aspects of concern or goals that the Roundtable wishes to address and achieve.

A trial and error stage is necessary for this type of mapping device because the food system continuously changes as member organizations become more or less involved within the Roundtable’s network. Internal changes to members or the structure of the Roundtable itself could also occur irregularly as they develop to suit the priorities of the food system. It is anticipated that the logistics involved with profiling to categorize the database of stakeholder groups and organizations could take up to a year’s time. Additionally, on a yearly basis a third party perspective could be used to re-evaluate the mapping system as unforeseeable changes are anticipated.
The mapping system suggested is theoretical and therefore needs to be tested in a functioning food system scenario. Overall the goal is to eventually be able to map the food system on a larger scale. This is what will allow for a better understanding of any existing gaps and patterns, which the Roundtable is currently trying to address.
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# APPENDIX A - Profile Table of Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Type of stakeholder</th>
<th>When Established</th>
<th>Associated or linked with</th>
<th>Purpose (Objectives)</th>
<th>Structure (SET UP)</th>
<th>Function (What they do)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Working Centre</td>
<td>Social Economy</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>worth a second look, computer recycling, Grow- Herbal Gardens, Queen St. Commons Cafe, Recycle Cycles, Barter Works</td>
<td>to link community members and to provide services to people to help themselves</td>
<td>corporation</td>
<td>provide services such as, job search resource center, integrated supportive housing, and access to technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Local Organic Food Team &quot;LOFT&quot;</td>
<td>Social Economy</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Loft came out of OCO to increase organic acreage</td>
<td>to increase communication between producers and consumers</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>by pooling their resources - deliver fruit and vegetable boxes to depots where customers pick them up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Waterloo Hen Association</td>
<td>Social Economy</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Places that already allow chickens to be kept on city properties are London, Niagara Falls, Victoria and places in the US</td>
<td>Working for the advancement of small scale urban chicken raising - reduce industrialization aspects and to raise healthier - Hen keeping as part of an urban food security initiative - local food and local food security</td>
<td>An association of WL residents</td>
<td>Families or individuals - Back yard chicken farms - treat chickens more as a pet then a commodity - raising 4-8 chickens in coops (not free roaming) to collect eggs for their own consumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives Journal</td>
<td>Private Sector</td>
<td>Published since 1971</td>
<td>The website is produced with ON Media Development Corporation and ON Tillium Foundation - Also official publication of the environmental studies Association of Can</td>
<td>To offer a vision of a more sustainable future and the tools needed to take us there.</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Alternatives goes to a deeper level of analysis and insight than mainstream press -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foodlink</td>
<td>Social Economy</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Elmira Produce Auction Cooperative (EPAC)</td>
<td>Promoter of healthy local food systems. Educate. Provide marketing and consulting services to local farms and other businesses. Engage decision makers in policies and practises that support the production and sale of local food products</td>
<td>Board of Directions, but no official membership-based.</td>
<td>Support and connect farms and food businesses, provide local food education and outreach in our community, engage decision makers in putting local food policy on the community’s agenda / Buy Local! Buy Fresh! program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Organic Growers</td>
<td>Social Economy</td>
<td>early 1980s</td>
<td>FoodLink/ Waterloo Rountable / member of the organic council of ontario</td>
<td>To lead local and national communities towards sustainable organic stewardship of land, food and fibre while respecting nature, upholding social justice and protecting natural resources. Supporting farmers and consumers.</td>
<td>Connected to the regions through eleven regional “Chapters”, four affiliated organizations</td>
<td>Promote handbooks and guidelines for any type of organic grower. Educate small scale organic farmers and gardeners on pricing and generating money, growing techniques, transitions, promotion of your goods. (example, Organic Week)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo - Federation of Agriculture (OFA)</td>
<td>Public Sector</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>The WFA is one of the originating sponsors of Foodlink.</td>
<td>OFA works collaboratively towards a profitable, sustainable future for Ontario farmers through planning and strong provincial policy</td>
<td>15 to 18 zone directors in province - 100 members at county levels to the Policy Advisory Council (PAC)</td>
<td>Represent 37,000 farm families. Represent and champion the interests of Ontario farmers. Generating policy documents. Holding rallies around Ontario (Toronto, Guelph, Ottawa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Community Gardening Council</td>
<td>Social Economy</td>
<td>around 2000</td>
<td>Promotes FoodLink for access to local food</td>
<td>Promote and sustain community gardens throughout Waterloo Region. Through strong, supportive infrastructure enabling residents to have access to land and to fresh, affordable food by growing their own</td>
<td>40 community gardens with more than 750 participants in the Region of Waterloo as well as an allotment garden in the City of Kitchener.</td>
<td>Provide gardening tips (building and maintaining), promote community gardens, map of community gardens in the Waterloo area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX B - Interview Responses for The Community Gardening Council
Answers compiled from Carol Popovic, Alisa McClurg, and Violet Grimm.

1. **What is your position with The Community Gardening Council (CGC) in the Kitchener-Waterloo (KW) Region?**
   I provide staff support to the community garden council and the community garden network.
   Communications Lead
   Garden Coordinator, since member at large, as the years went by….been away…but will attend occasional meetings.

2. **How long have you been working for CGC?**
   I have been working with this project since 2005.
   September 2010.
   Since 2000.

3. **When was CGC established as an organization and do they have an office location?**
   The CGN was established in around 1997 and consisted of volunteer area garden coordinators. Three agencies were involved; The KW Foodbank, The Working Centre and Public Health. It was established to provide a network of support to the coordinators. The CGC was established in 2005 to help promote and sustain community gardens. The network decided that that additional support was needed to raise awareness, provide education and to obtain resourcing for the gardens and coordinators. Not sure when established. We meet at the Region each month. But no official office. Downtown kitcheners at The Working Center.

4. **Does CGC have a website providing information about its history and projects they are currently involved in?**
   So far we have been using the information provided at www.together4health.ca.
   The website is at [www.community-gardens.ca](http://www.community-gardens.ca) and [www.region.waterloo.on.ca/ph](http://www.region.waterloo.on.ca/ph) click on resources and community gardens.
   Yes, there is one, but not sure what it is.

5. **How does CGC attain plots of land for creating a new community gardens? Is this done through private donations, working with the regions planning division etc.?**
   The gardens are all started grass roots. People are interested in starting gardens in their neighbourhood. CGC walks them through the steps and connects them to available resources. A combination of public and private donations. We don’t actually obtain the plots though – the community groups do.
   Some churches are willing to spare the land to have a community garden. There is also a Laurel Creek garden. My garden is at Lutheran Reform Church, so people gave donations to help with maintenance. The region gave some money for small spending on water. Other land is dormant, that some individuals may volunteer.

6. **What barriers has CGC experienced in regards to its development and expansion within the KW region?**
   Recruiting people with the necessary skills, resources and obtaining local sponsorship especially with local business.
   Supportive municipal policies – we have been working to this end.
   Not sure. Although we’re not attempting to expand per se. It’s more like we’re trying to help the
Some spaces are very limited, lack of land. As far as gardeners go, some have experienced vandalism by children. We need recreation centres for kids to do something constructive.

7. Has CGC experienced any barriers with managing its existing community gardens (keeping participates/volunteers, attaining seeds for planting, selling produce etc.)?

The garden coordinators are the key to the sustainability of the gardens. We stress the importance of each garden being managed by a committee comprised of its gardeners. In the past, gardens have come close to closing if no committee exists and the garden coordinators are no longer able to volunteer their time. Each garden has to sustain itself monetarily. They have to charge plot fees each year and that money is put back into the garden. See #6.

Garden coordinators have to buy their own seeds. I buy from Ontario Seeds (very good), but if you buy your seeds from the dollar store or Canadian Tire, you can have a bad experience with growth, because the seeds can be really old. Sometimes the Horticultural Society will provide seeds from time to time, otherwise you have to buy your own. The produce we grow is sometimes shared with other gardeners or neighbours, and some even bring the food to the House of Friendship or Count Just House.

8. What would you consider as the largest gap or barrier within KW’s overall food system?

We need a local food centre with neighbourhood food animators for neighbourhood food projects. Other gaps have to do with overregulated farm to consumer policies; global supermarket purchasing policies; need for self-sustaining infrastructure. Accessibility. Food is sold in only a few, sparsely spread out grocery stores. We need to create community gardens and farmer’s markets throughout the city. Definitely a lack of land. My church is big enough, but we do not want to expand the garden. Also a lack of funding, because we always have needs. We recently held a fundraiser that allowed us to build a shed.

9. Do local farmers have any involvement with CGC?

No

Not sure. I’m not the one to ask about that.

Farmers would not have time to spend with us and our 10 x 10 piece of garden. No spare time.

10. Has CGC formed any partnerships with other food system organizations within KW? Or are there any partnerships that they would like to bridge?

We have a partnership with Opportunities Waterloo Region and Public Health. We had a member of CGC @ Food System Round Table but that member no longer is involved with CGC and the FSRT does not select its membership according to representation from organizations. Also, due to scheduling conflicts, many of our members have day time work and most organizations meet during the day. Not sure. I’m new.

The House of Friendship.

11. What prospects or changes does CGC anticipate for the next 5 years? Is there a set plan to follow or are decisions based on current trends?

CGC did a prioritization plan and that involves; 1) supportive municipal policies, and 2) inclusive gardening initiatives. We are currently working towards supportive municipal official plans and physically and culturally accessible gardens.
The idea is that CGC would eventually become an independently operating body, without requiring any assistance from the Region. Helping the House of Friendship is a great cause, but the center should have been relocated some place and not downtown, because there is no room for a community garden their, and it would be nice to see the House of Friendship giving the users of a program a sense of purpose and motivation by allowing them to work in a garden. Community gardens should be used as a way to provide people with basic food supply, for those who really need assistance (i.e. those on welfare).
APPENDIX C - Interview Responses for Canadian Organic Growers

Spoke with Tegan Renner.

1. What is your position with Canadian Organic Growers?
I am the outreach and events coordinator for the Perth, Waterloo, and Wellington chapter. Some of work involves logistics and promotions for Organic Week, booking farmers, and raising consumer awareness, and setting up farmer training or coordinating.

2. How long have you been in your position with COG?
I have been with COG since last November (2009).

3. Who have your events been attracting?
The training workshops are just for farmers with focus on the process of being a certified organic farmer. The focus is less on the production side, but there are elements as well. The goal is to have more farmers transitioning. Typically there have been really low participation numbers (with the transitioning of farmers) for the course because you cannot force people to switch over their farming practices. A distance extension is offered for this course to cover Perth, Waterloo and Wellington area to try and cover more ground.
The initial program workshops the farmers have to pay for but a free program advisor is set up to work with the farmer to help get them started.
The consumer events are much better attended for example during organic week there was a good turnout for the FRESH film screening in Waterloo and Guelph.

4. What has been the rate of transitioning to organic farming?
We are just starting to track certified organic farms of the area right now. It will be a part of the organic directory you can find online which is in the process of being updated. Formal tracking is just starting as 2010 is the baseline year where progression will be assessed.

5. Are there any policies restricting certified organic growers?
Community Organic Growers is not involved with policies. The Organic Council of Ontario really handles the policy side of things, not the regional level.

6. Do you have partnerships in Waterloo?
Yes, we have a committee member that sits on the Roundtable and also for the Guelph/Wellington Food Roundtable. Other partnerships include the Ecological farmers of Ontario.

7. What would Canadian Organic Growers consider the biggest gap within the KW’s food system?
Helping to bridge gaps between consumers and produces from direct sales. We are unable to have an impact on the social justice of the issues. It is difficult question because some of the efforts are underway with FoodLink: promoting culinary tourism and highlighting local food but it doesn’t address food security or links a food system making local food available to all people.

8. What direction do you anticipate COG to go in the next 5 years?
COG would want to continue building relationships within institutions, as they are currently doing. However support is needed for these projects and to be embraced more by people. Also, there is potential to stepping up to the bigger buyers in the institution.