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Big context

Can ‘Food Hubs’ catalyse and support local food systems in Victoria and Australia?

1. Work with stakeholders to design and ‘establish?’ a Food Hub in Casey
2. Develop an effective framework for assessing / evaluating the impact of Food Hubs
3. Establish the Australian Food Hubs Network to share knowledge

Two Years . . .

1. Mapping of the ‘state of play’ in Casey’s local / regional food

2. Hub and system’ design work
3. Investigating feasibility
4. Share knowledge
## Phase 1 Project Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Milestones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work Program 1</strong></td>
<td>Work Program 1 Milestones:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Early December 2012: Key Stakeholder Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work Program 2</strong></td>
<td>Work Program 2a Milestones:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Food Hubs Network: Establishment of a best practice knowledge base and network</td>
<td>• December 21st 2012: Summary paper of best practice case studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• November 2012: Case studies on AFHN website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• December 10th 2012: Summary paper of draft Food Hub evaluation considerations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work Program 2b Milestones:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• AFHN website live by November 1 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Communication system established by November 10 2012: social media, blogs, newsletter and yammer activity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Aim:** To identify, map and engage potential partners in development of a Food Hub

**Objectives:**
- Build knowledge about Casey’s existing local food system (benchmark);
- Explore opportunities and barriers to development of a local food system
- Identification and engagement of key stakeholders

**Aim:** To draw on existing knowledge to inform project development and potential from successful innovations in Victoria, Australia and internationally.

**Objectives:**
- Research initiatives and niche development in other countries, Australia and Victoria
- Explore design features of systems that are successfully improving community health and well being

**Aim:** Support and enable the establishment of the AFHN as a vehicle for propagating this knowledge and methodology across Australia.

**Objectives:**
- Developing and using an online platform for AFHN and the Food Hub in Casey project.
- Supporting AFHN to be involved in the process
1. Who are the Stakeholders?

2. Spatial Mapping
   What and Where

3. Supply & Demand
   Who are the leaders?
   What do they think?

4. Establish Australian Food Hubs Network

5. Collaboratively develop and share knowledge

6. Research and Draw Upon Case Studies

Pathways for Casey
Understanding Local Context: Barriers and Opportunities for a Food Hub in Casey

Work Program 1

Objectives:
• Identify and engage key stakeholders
• Build knowledge about Casey’s existing local food system (benchmark);
• Explore *opportunities and barriers* to development of a local food system
1. Stakeholders – Regional Context

- City of Casey
  - Agricultural strategy
  - Economic development
  - Food security
  - Environment
- Top 5 Growers
- Southern Melbourne RDA
  (Regional Food Plan)
- CCMP Website
- Bunyip Food Belt
  - Recycled water infrastructure
  - Branding
  - Governance
- Gippsland (Food Plan)
- East Gippsland Food Cluster
- Cardinia
- Morn Pen
- Baw Baw
- Food Hub

VEIL | victorian eco innovation lab
VicHealth
Point of Clarity: Food Hub ≠ Food Policy

**Council Food Policy / Strategy**
Play key role in development of thriving regional food sector.


Priority areas include:
1. Transition opportunities for Casey growers
2. Economic development and jobs
3. Align with MPHP plan and Food Security Policy
4. Education and community strengthening

**Food Hub**
Catalyse local food system through strategic intervention that supports multiple outcomes, e.g.
1. New market opportunities for diverse producers (horticulture and others)
2. Immediate supply and market for local businesses
3. Access to healthy, affordable, attractive food options

**Mutual Benefits:**
- Networks and relationships across key sectors
- Leverage PCM initiatives in neighbouring councils
- Engage community around food
- Facilitate and coordinate diverse pilots / experiments
Stakeholders: Food System

Priorities for Food Hub:
• Are the farmers that want to sell more food locally?
• Are there people and businesses that want to buy it?

Supply

Demand
2. Mapping the Existing Food System - Spatial

What and who is already here?

» **Initial Scoping:** what’s in a food system

» **Data Collection:** availability, quality and consistency

» **Classification:** and reclassification… and reclassification… and reclassification…

» **Creating the maps:** what to depict and how
Working out what we’re interested in . .

**What’s in a Food System**

» Production
» Processing and manufacturing
» Fresh and prepared food retail
» Other meal / food services

**Frameworks**

» VLGA Food Security Assessment Tool
» VLUIS land use classifications
» FSPUD matrix
» Categories from other data sources

**Particularly relevant to Hub**

» Operational differences e.g. IGA vs Coles
» Existing local / regional focused efforts
» Potential wholesale buyers
## Working out what we have

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Used for</th>
<th>Strength</th>
<th>Weakness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health Master Database (2012)</td>
<td>Food premises</td>
<td>Current Detailed retail</td>
<td>No meat No production No manufacturing No transport No wholesale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANZSIC Database 1 – 3977</td>
<td>Production Manufacturing Wholesale Some retail</td>
<td>Geocoded Useful classification Detailed production Detailed manufacturing &amp; wholesale</td>
<td>Only from 3977 Retail not comprehensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANZSIC Database 2 – Bugseye (2010?)</td>
<td>Production Manufacturing Wholesale</td>
<td>Detailed production Detailed manufacturing &amp; wholesale Whole of Casey</td>
<td>No Supermarket/ grocery 2010 data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gaps in data</td>
<td>Yellow Pages/True local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illogical data</td>
<td>Google Maps/MapInfo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collating multiple data sources</td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Developing a Useful Classification System

Layer
- Food Distribution
- Food Manufacturing and Processing
- Food Production
- Food Relief
- Fresh Food Retail
- Prepared Food Retail
- Wholesale Buyers
- Other

Category 1
- Fresh Food Retail

Category 2
- Supermarkets
- Food Retailers (specialised)

Category 3
- Large (Big 3)
- Small/Independent
- Fruit and Vegetables

etc
Classification and Building Maps

Food System Tool?
» Is this classification system useful to others?
» How should it most effectively be shared and developed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Layer</th>
<th>Cat 1</th>
<th>Label (more info where useful)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Distribution</td>
<td>Food Distribution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Manufacturing and Processing</td>
<td>Bread/Cakes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy</td>
<td>Fruit and Vegetables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat/Poultry/Smallgoods</td>
<td>Other Manufacturing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Production</td>
<td>Vegetable Growing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grain/Crops</td>
<td>Fish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock Production (Dairy/Beef/Sheep)</td>
<td>Orchard/Groves/Plantations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Production</td>
<td>Pig/Pre铟/Eggs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Relief</td>
<td>Meat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packages</td>
<td>Assorted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresh Food Retail</td>
<td>Supermarkets (Int. Groceries)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supermarkets (Big 3)</td>
<td>e.g. Coles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supermarkets (Small / Independent)</td>
<td>Fresh Food Retail (General and Convenience Stores)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresh Food Retail (Specialised)</td>
<td>Fresh Food Retail (Proposed NAC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Food Systems</td>
<td>Farmers Market</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Co-op</td>
<td>Prepared Food Retail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Pizzas</td>
<td>Coffee and Savvies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast Food Chain</td>
<td>Restaurant/Cafe/Hotel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take Away</td>
<td>e.g. Fish and Chips</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Meal Services</td>
<td>Meals (Catering)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meals (Hotels)</td>
<td>Meals (Aged Care)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meals (Childcare)</td>
<td>Meals (Community)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meals (Hospital)</td>
<td>Meals (School)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meals (Sporting Club)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How to get the data onto a map
- Geocodes Vs. MapInfo
- Intramaps / GIS vs. Google
Creating and Using Maps from Council GIS

- How to best represent the data
  - Level of detail
  - Type of maps

Completed...
- First maps
- Workshop with Council to discuss
- Revisions and suggestions for rework
Tool: Google Fusion Data and Mapping

Food System Tool?

» Once cleaned and classified, the data can easily be drawn into a Google framework, making it very accessible to anyone to explore Casey’s food system (see pics below)

TBC

» Public availability – ‘technically’ nothing stopping us making this available for people to play with
» Checking w. Council whether ok to do so
» Detailed methodology that others can emulate with their own data
Outcomes

City of Casey

» Increased knowledge of data available and of food premises in Casey
» Mapping tool (available on Intramaps system) for considering food within planning and other decision making
» Starting point for improved articulation and collection of relevant information

Food Hub

» Initial maps: for Council input and suggestions
» Public maps: to inform public discussions and design processes next year
» Increased spatial understanding of the area
» Google mapping tool

Australian Food Hubs Network

» Methodology: will be available for others to emulate

Mapping Methodology and Report

? Casey Food System Mapping Tool

VEIL, vicHealth
Food System Mapping – Indicators of Food Insecurity

Adam Rossimel (Masters of Planning)

» Aim: to test the hypothesis that those most at risk to food security in Melbourne are located in the outer suburbs

**Methodology**

» Examined 22 LGAs (7 inner, 8 middle and 7 outer)
» Tested each for accessibility and affordability indicators of food security
» Collection District + 2km radius
» Identified healthy and unhealthy food stores
» Conducted Victorian Healthy Food Basket Assessments
» Analysed VAMPIRE indices

**Key Findings**

» No difference in price of food across inner, middle and outer suburbs, but significant variations in cost of food as proportion of household income
» Declining access to healthy food options further from the city
» Similarly, ratio of unhealthy to healthy food increased (outer suburbs 6x less access to healthy food)
» *Green grocers provided significantly cheaper fresh fruit and vegetables than in the major supermarkets, a price differential of up to 23%.*
» Significantly fewer greengrocers in outer suburbs, especially growth areas
3. Supply and Demand

Supply: Producer Interviews
Demand: Business Interviews
Demand: Preliminary Household Survey
Producer Interviews: Design and Aims

3 key aims:
• Locate and engage interested farmers in the project
• Deepen understanding of local context, production and distribution patterns
• Explore opportunities and barriers to developing a food hub/scaling up local food distribution

Sample design: 16 formal interviews.

A range of network meetings and informal conversations occurred prior to and during the interview process. It became obvious from the outset that producers beyond the borders of the City of Casey needed to be included to adequately explore the flow of food across the SE region.

Interview Design: 3 sections:
• Context
• Current Distribution
• Response to, interest in alternative models and what would work for them.
Producer Interview Breakdown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Casey: 9 interviews</th>
<th>Cardinia: 5 interviews</th>
<th>Baw Baw: 1 interview</th>
<th>Mornington Peninsula: 1 interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 large</td>
<td>1 large</td>
<td>1 dairy and egg producer</td>
<td>1 small mixed vegetable grower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 medium</td>
<td>1 medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 small</td>
<td>1 small vegetable grower</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vegetable growers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 small fruit</td>
<td>1 dairy producer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grower</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 beef producer</td>
<td>1 orchardist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 3 of the 15 interviews- female farmers
- 1 farmer <30, 2 < 40, 3 < 50
- 11 farmers self identified as ‘conventional’
- 5 farmers - accredited/marketed their products as organic/Enviroveg.
- Interviews were transcribed and analysed to draw out recurrent themes and issues
Context: common issues for farm viability

Impact of Urban Growth:
- right to farm - ‘we’re the outsiders’
- RATES and land prices

Council – perceived lack of consultation and communication

Undercut by cheap products
- ‘Asian backyarders’ and other low cost operators:
  ‘The price they sell this stuff at, we can’t grow it at’
Most distribution is through the supermarkets and the wholesale market - this is working for some but not others

**Supermarkets**
Pro: quantity, security  
Con: price squeeze, dominance

**Wholese**
‘None of the farmers supply shops directly round here on a big scale. You’ll find it all goes to Footscray, and the local shops buy it from there and bring it back’.

**Move to Epping is a concern**
It’s going to knock a lot of growers on the head’  
‘They don’t want the little growers in there, so they just want to squeeze us out’.
Is there existing retail and community demand?

Uncertain of community demand, feel unvalued by/invisible to the broader community:

‘They don’t see us as an asset to the local community, they see us more as a peripheral thing…’

Aware that independent grocers are also having a rough time

‘what happens to the local fruiterers because they’re in the market sometimes 5 days a week and anything that hurts them flows back through to us, the commercial growers.’

Challenges:

• Does the community value farming in the region?

• Will demand increase with activity / identification of local farmers?

• Is it possible to develop a Food Hub that complements existing independent retail?
There are very different world views, but farmers do work together

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overarching narratives</th>
<th>Will farmers work together?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small high value</td>
<td>Diverse farmers do collaborate in the region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘You either get bigger or you get better’</td>
<td>‘You develop such a good relationship with the guys and we do help each other out’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever expanding</td>
<td>Successful formal ventures may require more ‘value-alignment’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘It’s all about economies of scale, because we produce a lot more product now the margins are a lot lower … so you have to turn over a lot more product’</td>
<td>‘They’re all like-minded farmers, which is a big thing- they’re all farming the same way and it’s a different way’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Challenges:**

- Diversity of perspectives- could/should a food hub attempt to work with them all?
A Food Hub? Farmers interested . . but

» **Interest Scale:**

‘That would be fantastic if you can get it to work’

‘I’d like to distribute more locally. It’s the logistics…We’re too busy to focus on the distribution side of things’

» **Scale of Operation:**

Big farmer: ‘If you’re talking about doing it on a small scale with testing the waters so to speak that’s fine but you’re not going to get a huge uptake.’

**Challenges:**

- Value proposition v. different for small and large farmers
- Plenty of ‘followers’ – are there leaders?
- For some farmers, consistency and ability to take bulk is non-negotiable
- How will it work – and for who? How do we find out?
Business Interview Design and Aims:

3 key aims:
• Locate and engage potential interested business
• Deepen understanding of local context, buying and distribution patterns
• Explore opportunities and barriers to developing a hub

Interview Design:
• Part 1: Context
• Part 2: Distribution/Procurement Patterns
• Part 3: Interest in alternative models and what would work for them.

Sample Design:
Focus on Casey Businesses:
• 8 interviews in Casey
• 1 in Dandenong
• 3 in Pakenham
Competitive retail space with little direct buying

Already fiercely competitive
‘There are about 14 different supermarkets in a 5 to 10 kilometre radius’

A retail hub would intensify this
‘They (grocers)’ll be looking at you as competition for sure’

Minimal direct local buying
‘Our fruit and veg comes from markets in the city’
‘do some directly now- asparagus… cherries…potatoes’

Test the waters before committing:
‘I would love to sample some stuff and see how it goes and compare to our current suppliers.’

Challenges:
• Will not be well received if perceived to compete w. existing retail businesses
• Gap in local procurement system
Local Procurement – happening but piecemeal

Lack of systems/access to local produce:
‘there isn’t a lot I’ve seen around this area.’
‘it’s about getting know different people and what they can provide and getting their contact details and giving them a go’

Concerns re efficiency, price and quantity:
‘If we could get really good fresh stuff at a reasonable price it would be wonderful’

Unwilling to compromise existing relationships
‘It’s also a bit of a problem because I have relationships with suppliers – you know for 8 or 9 years – my loyalty is important’

Challenges
• Needs to be easy
• Competitive on price
• How to handle quantity /seasonality issue?
• Support not compete with existing relationships
Uncertain community demand and awareness

Price squeeze in the mortgage belt:
‘New houses, young people, they’re not going to spend $10 when they can get the same for $4.’

Demand in some sectors for organic, fresh, healthy food
‘The biggest change has been to the organics/health range in the last five years. It’s quite dramatic’.

Wider awareness:
‘It’s about changing people’s habits though…to make it really work you have to change 80%. At the moment you may have 30%’

Challenges:
• Community awareness and interest unknown
• Price likely to be critical
Existing business activity:

» 4 box schemes operating – 1 based in Melbourne, 1 in Yarra Ranges, 1 in Berwick.
» Aussie Farmers Direct - Berwick
» Farmers Markets
» Myuna Market
» The Andrews Centre (co-op)
» Herdshare – Organic Dairy and Beef – Berwick depot.
» Handful direct farm-business relationships (within Casey and into Melbourne) to grocer…
» Tully’s, Cranbourne Market etc
Household Demand (Matthew Sacco) – Shoppers’ attitudes to fresh local produce

» What are the shoppers’ current purchasing behaviours of fresh food produce (fruit and vegetables)?

» How do shoppers define “Local Fresh Produce?”

» What are the shopper’s attitudes towards local fresh produce?

» Do shoppers have the intent of purchasing local fresh produce whilst purchasing their groceries?

» Do relationships exist between Casey’s demographics and their attitude towards fresh local produce?
Key Findings

» Higher response rate in northern part of Casey
Where do Casey shoppers shop?
Some preliminary results

» More than half of the shoppers surveyed (52.3%) stated that their household spends between $30-$59 per week on fresh fruit and vegetables.

» 36.7% of respondents say they check the origins of fresh food produce when grocery shopping (19.1% never check whilst the remaining 44.2% sometimes check)

» For those who check: 39.4% use labels; 20.6% say they use signage; and another 15.5% say they use strategies at point of purchase

» 56.6% of shoppers indicated that local fresh food produce is food that comes from Victoria or Australia whilst only 43.4% of shoppers define local fresh food produce is food the comes from local farmers markets, local farms or from Casey and surrounding areas.

» 65.9% of shoppers say “when purchasing fresh fruit and vegetables, I care were it is grown”
Influences in buying more local produce

- Product quality
- Cost/price
- More easily available
- The brand
- Variety of products
- Portion size
What does this mean?

» Shoppers generally displayed a positive attitude towards fresh local produce

» BUT responses highly dominated by northern (wealthier) communities e.g. Berwick

» Strongest motivation to support local industry and farming enterprises

» Does intent reflect behaviour? Yes and . .

  ... the influence of the subjective norms shoppers are exposed to

  ... shoppers’ perceived behavioural control when analysing how a shopper’s intention is developed

  ... effect of impulse buying and unplanned purchasing
Australian Food Hubs Network: Establishment of a Best Practice Knowledge Base and Network

Work Program 2

To draw on existing knowledge to inform project development and potential from successful innovations in Victoria, Australia and internationally.

- Research initiatives and niche development in other countries, Australia and Victoria
- Support and enable the establishment of the AFHN as a vehicle for propagating this knowledge and methodology across Australia
Australian Food Hubs Network - Website

Profiles of Australian projects and people involved in them

Searchable database of international case studies

www.foodhubs.org.au

Launch February 2012
Building the AFHN

» Public network: active Facebook page: 135 ‘likes’, frequent comments and activity

» Community of Practice: Yammer network for discussion and sharing amongst people working on Food Hubs around Australia (currently 13 active members)
Pathways for Casey

Where to from here . . .

Designing a Food Hub
Action Research: Test and Build

1. Seed an Idea

Scoping Project - 2011

2. Explore local context in more depth

Work Program 1

3. Iterative Design - Practical Application of Themes and Assumptions

• Emerging ‘themes’ - can we turn these into assumptions we can test?
• What’s the smallest REAL test we could do (design experiments)?
• Can our ‘tests’ build interest and momentum?
Assumption 1: Best to start with Wholesale

Phase 1 results:

» Competitive retail space
» Need to support existing independent retail/distribution activity
» Concern re jeopardising existing/long-term relationships

Provide opportunities for existing relationships and businesses

Example: Local Food Hub

» 60-75 local farmers deliver produce to warehouse.
» Aggregate and distribute: schools, hospitals, restaurants, retail and food distributors
» Work with buyers and farmers to produce a ‘demand document’ each season
Assumption 2: Businesses potentially interested if easy and cost competitive

Phase 1 results:
» Businesses lack streamlined pathway of accessing local food
» Concern over efficiency and price
» Ambiguity – what is local?
» Guarded interest - like to test the waters…

How can we test and build business interest?

Opportunities to easily purchase local food
• Online platforms
• Catalogue?
• Pilot new distribution systems

Connections and networks
• Local food dinners, networking opps. etc for farmers and businesses
Assumption 3: If local produce is available the community will want it

- Farmers think people lack knowledge and interest
- Businesses think hip pocket wins
- Community says they’re interested
- 2 box schemes say there is strong demand for fresh, local produce

How can we test *and build* community demand?

**Local branding**
- North Carolina 10% Campaign - branding and awareness raising

**Pop-Ups**
- Markets – schools, neighborhoods, shopping centers
- Meals – food vans, festivals

---

Join the 10% Campaign  
*a Center for Environmental Farming Systems Initiative*
Assumption 4: There’s something about schools

**Phase 1 results:**

- Schools mentioned by many people
- 44% of households are made up of couples with children (34% in Greater Melbourne) (ABS 2011).
- 66 primary schools and 29 secondary schools - many of which have canteens...
- 49 Kindergartens, 69 Childcare centers, 9 before and after school care programs – many provide fruit and morning / afternoon tea...

**Possibilities**

- Pop up school markets
- Collection nodes for local produce orders/boxes
- US farm to school model – but in Australian context- more around linkages – canteens, food service providers
Assumption 5: Food relief networks could be connected with local farmers

Phase 1 results:
» (Preliminary) existing centers don’t engage in much local food procurement, but are interested

Myuna Market, Andrews Centre- NO – but interested.

» There are existing networks and centers that could be supported to increase healthy fresh food access and utilisation

» Included in distribution / aggregation system - not just food relief?

Example: Stop Community Food Centre
» Food relief, education, food bank but ALSO farmers markets, catering business, community hub
Revised Goals and Approach:

» Public Stakeholder Forum to be held in Casey in February 2012
» Design process to occur Feb-June 2012: will include significant student work component
» Surveys to become an ongoing tool for understanding the position and needs of those working with us (rather than mapping system more broadly)
» Testing the assumptions drawn from the mapping phase through Action Research and experimentation
» Identify and ‘poke’ intervention points e.g. facilitating Council purchase of food from local farmers