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Food is critical to human survival and is a cornerstone of community prosperity. To many it is also a birthright as basic as air, water, and shelter. Food secure communities - where all people have adequate levels of nutrition, and where local needs are substantially supplemented through local production - are integral to a thriving, prosperous society, as well as to a resilient economy. As the UN Committee on World Food Security observes, “responsible investment in agriculture and food systems is essential for enhancing food security and nutrition and supporting the progressive realization of the right to adequate food.” But while we look to governments to ensure this level of responsible investment at scale, it is often the role of philanthropy to invest in experiments, test possibilities, and illuminate possible ways forward.

"When we think of food security we think about hampers and food banks and emergency food relief, but that’s food insecurity. Food security is when you don’t know where your next meal is coming from, whereas food security comes when producers and farmers get paid fair market value for their produce and can ensure consistent food supply."

— Zai Mamdani, YYC Food Security Fund
The Broader Story

As the United Nations (UN) Food Systems Summit notes, “the term ‘food system’ refers to the constellation of activities involved in producing, processing, transporting and consuming food.” Understanding the food system and its corresponding ‘food shed’ in a given country, region or local community is key to ensuring food security, which in turn is among the most basic and vital of human needs. Food security, as defined by the UN, is when “all people, at all times, have physical, social, and economic access to sufficient, safe, and nutritious food that meets their food preferences and dietary needs for an active and healthy life.”

Food insecurity - the inverse of food security - not only negatively impacts health and survival, but also learning and community prosperity. Moreover, food security is a UN Sustainable Development goal - Goal 2: Zero Hunger - a goal that the world, Canada included, has so far underperformed on, relative to the benchmarks set.

Food security, as defined by the UN, is when “all people, at all times, have physical, social, and economic access to sufficient, safe, and nutritious food that meets their food preferences and dietary needs for an active and healthy life.”

Worldwide, despite the dramatic increase in food production since the Green Revolution of the 1960s, over 820 million people are food insecure, with global demand for food expected to increase by nearly 60% over the next four decades. Fully 12.4% of Canadians or 11 million households (representing more than four million individuals) experience food insecurity. Food insecurity was mentioned for the first time in a federal throne speech last year, specifically in reference to strengthening local supply chains. Despite Alberta’s prosperity, food insecurity is either just over or just under the national average (depending on how it is measured), but is at risk of becoming more acute in the short term, with the additional challenges of the COVID-19 pandemic and employment decline in the petroleum industry.

There are actually at least two distinct understandings of food security, and its inverse - food insecurity. Many people think of food security from the consumption standpoint: the universal availability and affordability of nutritionally viable food for consumption. Downstream food insecurity is arguably not a social problem in and of itself, but rather is almost always a symptom or indicator of a lack of income. The relationship between food insecurity and lack of income is most obvious for severely food insecure households.

There is also a relationship to housing tenure: Many studies have found that owner-occupied households are more food secure than renter-occupied homes, though this may be a more trivial factor, insofar as in Canada housing tenure is more closely tied to income than in Europe, for example.

Downstream food security is also an important determinant of health. Individuals who are food insecure are nutritionally deprived and have poorer health outcomes, including higher rates of obesity, type 2 diabetes, diet-related metabolic and chronic diseases, as well as an impaired ability to work and learn. A severely food insecure person will cost the public health care system more than double what a food secure person will. There is a particularly strong association between food insecurity and mental health challenges, such as increased risk of depression and suicide, which could be partially due to factors such as stress and anxiety.

Others think of food security from a production perspective: Either as the ability of the food production system to maintain healthy land, soil, genetic diversity and agricultural resilience, including in the face of droughts and other natural disasters (climate-change induced or otherwise), or as the continuity and resilience of food supply chains. We can refer to these risks as forms of upstream food insecurity.
Upstream food security includes the ability of the system to supply local demand in the face of shocks to either the export market (such as those induced by a pandemic or war) or to the supply chain (for example, because of natural disasters like those that affected the BC Lower Mainland or accidents like Suez Canal blockage, both events being among the top news stories of 2021). Canada has moved over time to a food distribution system built around just-in-time production and delivery, heightening the risk of upstream food insecurity. The sudden spike in demand for certain food items in the early stages of COVID, for example in pulses, pastas and bottled water, resulted in short-run stockouts - empty shelves in grocery stores.14 Some agricultural experts, like Evan Fraser, Director of the Arrell Food Institute at the University of Guelph, are raising questions about the national security risk attached to our reliance on the import of foreign produce. Fraser notes: “On fruits and vegetables, we are not secure at all,” warning that the country’s dependence on California and other southern growing regions for fresh produce through the winter has become a national security risk.15 This underscores why domestic and local production is so vital.

Among the factors impacting the food system, the upstream aspects (production, processing, transportation and distribution) receive less attention in an urban context than the downstream aspects (such as retail, food charity, and household access and consumption). This report aims to document the YYC Food Security Fund as a mainly upstream intervention, as one part of a constellation of efforts to improve access to food.

In addition to understanding the issue of food insecurity itself, there are numerous, well-documented factors that affect what solutions will be implemented (and how), and the ways in which success will be measured. These systemic factors have been noted where possible in this report, and include socioeconomic status, race, gender, and age, as well as less tangible factors like cultural mindsets and history. This report in places attempts to draw attention to certain issues affecting equity seeking communities, but it does not aim to be a fulsome analysis of the food system’s impact on equity seeking communities, nor does it recount the experiences that members of these groups have written about elsewhere with respect to how they have been variously impacted by or excluded from the food system.17

The story of food security in Canada, from early contact to contemporary policies and practices, is inextricably linked to colonization in the upstream sense, and shaped by Victorian paternalism in the downstream sense.18 Prior to contact and colonization, Indigenous Nations in Canada had highly specialized and diverse means for addressing food security that ranged from agriculture (e.g. the Iroquois), to aquaculture (e.g. the Tsimshian and Haida), to whaling (e.g. the Inuit), to complex animal harvesting practices (e.g. the Blackfoot use of the buffalo jump). Trade routes criss-crossed North America - what many First Nations people call Turtle Island. Knowledge about sustainable harvesting, husbandry, and the nutritional and medicinal qualities of plants, animals and fungi was not only on par with, or superior to, western science-informed understanding, but was essential to early settler survival.19

British colonization of Western Canada intensified with the transfer of Rupert’s Land from the Hudson Bay Company to the new Government of Canada as the Northwest Territories. Rapid and widespread settlement by European farmers and ranchers was facilitated by the Dominion Land Survey, in turn enabled through the establishment of numbered treaties, including Treaty 7. The displacement of Indigenous peoples from their territories was accompanied by many decades-long policies to actively undermine traditional food harvesting, trade, distribution and culinary practices. Starting in the late 1870s, the John A. Macdonald government used the disappearance/extermination of the buffalo, which drove plains Indigenous people into famine, to force nations to either come to the treaty table or risk starvation.20 Emergency food aid was then only provided to Treaty signatory peoples, typically by way of ration houses. As part of the colonization project, Indigenous food sovereignty was deliberately and systematically dismantled.

On the prairies, an entire food system (and culture) centered on the plains bison was replaced with agri-culture, a wholly incompatible system. Indigenous Peoples’ traditional diets were supplanted over time by such government-rationed food proxies as fortified biscuits and highly processed meat-paste products.21 Decades-long policy-driven undernourishment exacerbated Indigenous susceptibility to such chronic maladies as diabetes and cardiovascular disease.22

Euro-Canadian family farms flourished during most of the 20th century, notwithstanding the droughts and deprivation of the Great Depression. Agricultural and food co-ops, and policies ranging from supply management to the Canadian Wheat Board helped ensure stable markets, fair prices, and widespread prosperity for growers. While agricultural policy and practice over the past century has been mainly oriented to an export market, the last three decades have also seen increasing concentration, consolidation and corporatization of farming. Even as demand for agri-foods skyrocketed over the last half century, the number of farms has dwindled dramatically. Industrial scale cattle feedlots, hog lots, broiler chicken facilities, aquaculture and other intensive agricultural practices have become a more commonplace feature of the landscape, and small scale abattoirs have all but disappeared, yielding to large industrial meat-cutting facilities.23 In fact, just two processing facilities, run by Cargill and JBL respectively, supply 70% of Canada’s domestic beef market.24

...the country’s dependence on California and other southern growing regions for fresh produce through the winter has become a national security risk.”
— Evan Fraser, Arrell Ford Institute

As part of the colonization project, Indigenous food sovereignty was deliberately and systematically dismantled.
There have been demonstrable long-term benefits from global trade and export-orientation, but globalisation has also brought disruption, destabilization and too often destruction of viable local economies and community-scale prosperity. Farms have had to rely on lower wages and lower worker safety standards, and have turned to labour substitution by machinery and/or temporary foreign workers (through either the Seasonal Agricultural Workers Program or the Temporary Foreign Workers Program). Nearly half of farm operators in Alberta have a second off-farm job to make ends meet.28

As noted by Audra Stevenson, Leftovers Foundation, “we expect that we can buy avocados anytime of the year, and we don’t think twice about it.” We expect consistency in our grocery stores even if that means producers must go to increasing lengths to grow off-season produce.

Despite this dominant trend, we have seen a resurgence of interest, and consumer demand, for locally-grown, organic, heirloom, free-range, and humainely-reared products. Movements promoting such concepts as “Farm-to-Fork”, “100 Mile Diet”, “agro-ecology” and “regenerative farming” have emerged, gaining some traction with mostly middle class or more well-heeled consumers. But even as demand for these categories has grown from niche to mainstream, agricultural policies and regulations still show a preference for (and incentivize) export-oriented, large-scale production, as well as corporate-dominated supply chains and value-added production. Hundreds of small scale abattoirs, for example, once dotted the Canadian landscape. These have largely been replaced by industrial meat cutting and processing facilities.29

The COVID-19 pandemic opened a conversation window for Canadians to think more deeply about where their food comes from, how it is transported, and whether we are too reliant on food that must cross international borders. We remain happily unaware until disruptions caused by a crisis make us “suddenly - and painfully” aware of how fragile the system is.30 Most Canadians were not talking about “supply chains” two years ago, but now it is part of the daily lexicon. The way Canadian households consumed food has also changed dramatically as a result of the pandemic, away from the food service sector (restaurants, cafes, bars, and other eateries) toward meals prepared and consumed at home.31 Much of this took an artisanal turn, with homemade sourdough becoming a meme for the early lockdowns, leading in turn to flour rationing in grocery stores (the flour shortage was actually a packaging shortage, not due to a lack of milled wheat).32 Canada’s food distribution system, like much of the economy, is built around just-in-time manufacturing and delivery. The sudden spike in demand from consumers stockpiling items like canned goods, rice, and pasta created short-run stockouts.33 Food supply chains were also impacted by border closures and restrictions. Farmers, fishers, and ranchers with an online direct-to-consumer sales platform generally thrived during the pandemic, as consumers prioritized local food purchasing.34

The future of food production, distribution and consumption in Canada will be shaped by the policies governing family farm transitions and the subsequent rise of “Big Agriculture”. It will also be shaped by the climate crisis, the move to a net zero or low carbon economy, growing demographic diversity and heterogeneity of tastes and preferences, scientific advances in genetics, soil management and water conservation, and the need to find a better balance between food for export and food for domestic (and especially local) consumption. Another new driver that might turn out to be particularly important is the push for a more circular economy.36

Food retail in Canada, like many other western countries, is dominated by large, concentrated supermarket chains with significant bargaining and buying power, where bulk purchasing and low inventory stocks (relative to just-in-time product flows) can make market entry by smaller retailers difficult.35 This model relies on efficient, responsive, global supply chains, the resilience of which was tested during the COVID-19 pandemic. Uniquely, Calgary Co-op, the largest cooperative grocer in North America, has always held a significant (and usually the largest) market share in the city. However, it is unclear whether this translates into any more of a measurable commitment to local purchasing, despite the co-op model, and despite being owned by local farmers.

The completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway in 1883 also boosted the emerging coal industry. This along with the discovery of oil, which coincided with an agricultural recession, eventually attracted labourers and farmers away from agriculture and permanently shifted the economic structure of the province. Following World War II, increased labour shortage and cheaper farm machinery drove larger more intensive farming practices. The expanded food distribution network meant Alberta’s cities did not need to rely on local food sources and agricultural production in Alberta became largely export-oriented.”

Colleen Biggs, TK Ranch
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**Downstream Food Security in Canada: Poverty, Nutrition, and Affordability**

Downstream food insecurity is by no means a problem unique to Canada. In fact, according to the Social Progress Index, Canada now performs better than any other country on preventing undernourishment. However, there is still a shocking large proportion of food insecure Canadians. Over the past two years, the number of food insecure Canadians appears to have fluctuated wildly, with some reports suggesting a significant overall rise, while others report a drop due to new (albeit temporary) federal income supports. The food security picture is also more nuanced when one looks at the picture regionally, demographically, or through a lens of nutrition and dignity rather than abject food deprivation.

Modern food banks are an Alberta innovation, with the first food bank in Canada opening in Edmonton in 1981, as the infamous deep oilpatch recession of the 1980s set in. Calgary’s food bank opened a year later as an “inter-faith” amalgam of church food hamper programs. In addition to the downturn in the oilpatch, the 80s, 90s and early 2000s saw intensifying food insecurity and demand for food banks grew in these decades, such that the scale and sophistication of food insecure Canadians, were deemed to be food insecure, 1.2 million of whom were children. And the problem, in the near term, is at risk of getting worse: During the March 2021 HungerCount, a regular scan of food bank use over a one month period conducted by Food Banks Canada, there were over 1,300,000 visits to one of over 2,300 emergency food programs, a 20% increase from the same period in 2019. The HungerCount further notes that there is a volatile “perfect storm” afoot, with rapidly rising housing costs, unemployment, stagnant incomes and inflation of food prices combining to push more Canadians into downstream food insecurity. As food policy expert Sylvain Charlebois notes, “By December [2021], the average household will have to pay five per cent more for their groceries, or about $700 over the course of a year. In dollars, this is the largest increase in history.”

Similarly, food charity was ubiquitous in communities of all sizes for many decades prior. But charitable food programs such as hampers and community kitchens were largely run by churches and other religious organizations, and had not been professionalized. Even community gardens have a long history, dating back to the “Victory Gardens” of World War II.

The Canadian Community Health Survey (CCHS), administered by Statistics Canada, started in 2017 for the first time to measure household food insecurity in Canada. This survey revealed that 1 in 8 Canadians, or 4.4 million citizens (over 1 in 10 Canadians), were deemed to be food insecure, 1.2 million of whom were children. And the problem, in the near term, is at risk of getting worse: During the March 2021 HungerCount, a regular scan of food bank use over a one month period conducted by Food Banks Canada, there were over 1,300,000 visits to one of over 2,300 emergency food programs, a 20% increase from the same period in 2019. The HungerCount further notes that there is a volatile “perfect storm” afoot, with rapidly rising housing costs, unemployment, stagnant incomes and inflation of food prices combining to push more Canadians into downstream food insecurity. As food policy expert Sylvain Charlebois notes, “By December [2021], the average household will have to pay five per cent more for their groceries, or about $700 over the course of a year. In dollars, this is the largest increase in history.”

Modern food banks are an Alberta innovation, with the first food bank in Canada opening in Edmonton in 1981, as the infamous deep oilpatch recession of the 1980s set in. Calgary’s food bank opened a year later as an “inter-faith” amalgam of church food hamper programs. In addition to the downturn in the oilpatch, the 80s, 90s and early 2000s saw intensifying food insecurity and demand for food banks grew in these decades, such that the scale and sophistication of food bank operations now far exceeds their grassroots origins. But although things took a decided turn for the worse in this era, downstream food insecurity has been with us in Canada long before the 1980s.

**“[In 2017? 1 in 8 Canadians, or 4.4 million citizens (over 1 in 10 Canadians), were deemed to be food insecure, 1.2 million of whom were children.”**

— Tarasuk and Mitchell, 2020

**“By December [2021], the average household will have to pay five per cent more for their groceries, or about $700 over the course of a year. In dollars, this is the largest increase in history.”**

— Sylvain Charlebois

Like most of the globe’s cultures, food continues to play a central role in Indigenous culture and community, including through language and ceremony. However, the First Nations Food, Nutrition and Environment Study (2019) found that Indigenous food insecurity was up to seven times more prevalent than for Canadians as a whole, noting in particular significant eco-systemic reasons for hampered access to traditional foods. The same report found that “the diet of First Nation adults across Canada does not meet nutrition recommendations. There are inadequate intakes for vitamins A, D, and C, folate, calcium, and magnesium. On days when traditional food is present, recommendations for several nutrients are more likely to be met.” Food insecurity among First Nations communities specifically was found to be highest in Alberta, with prevalence of food insecurity at 60% of the adult population, vs. (a still alarmingly high) 48% average for First Nations across Canada. There are growing calls and actions in many parts of the country around Indigenous food sovereignty, food-based economic development, and food policy reforms that model reconciliation and decolonization. For example, the Indigenous Food Circle, supported through Lakehead University, “aims to reduce Indigenous food insecurity, increase food self-determination and establish meaningful relationships with the settler population through food.”

Regionally, food security is most severe in the far north, with 57% of Nunavummiut experiencing food insecurity. While Alberta does not stand out as more food insecure than the rest of Canada (with the previously noted exception of Indigenous people), over 12% of Alberta households nonetheless remain food insecure. Nonwhite households experience higher than average food insecurity, with over a quarter of Black and Indigenous households deemed food insecure. Black households are 3.5 times as likely to be food insecure. Food insecurity is also a factor in rising health care costs. Importantly, senior citizens experience the lowest levels of food insecurity, due to a more robust income support system, including Old Age Security and Canada Pension.

According to the World Food Programme, 1 of every 2 children on earth (in 161 countries) benefit from some form of universal free or subsidized school meal program.

On the other hand, children are still overrepresented among those relying on emergency food aid. The introduction of the Canada Child Benefit has had a measurable (though modest) positive effect on reducing food insecurity, including a modest decline among children. But many children are still going to school hungry, which has a severe impact on educational outcomes for those students, and ultimately costs the economy and society down the road. According to the Coalition for Healthy School Food, Canada is one of the only OECD countries without a national school food program. In fact, according to the World Food Programme, 1 of every 2 children on earth (in 161 countries) benefit from some form of free or subsidized school meal program.
While food banks are obviously not a solution to chronic or long-term food insecurity (and the same can be said of community hamper programs, soup kitchens, volunteer school lunch programs and many other forms of emergent, temporary intervention), it would be wrong to frame a food secure Canada as one in which food banks disappear. Even with far-reaching, progressive income support reforms, regardless of whether or not those reforms include universal basic income, food banks and other more informal community support systems will continue to play a role in emergency food aid, for example when a disaster such as a fire or flood happens, and communities need to be evacuated.

Even with far-reaching, progressive income support reforms, regardless of whether or not those reforms include universal basic income, food banks and other more informal community support systems will continue to play a role in emergency food aid.

Overall, the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the downstream food system has been profound, but quite varied in terms of who has suffered and who has prospered. All Canadians have experienced a steady rise in food costs, driven partly by the pandemic and compromised global trade and supply chains, and partly by climate change. According to the Maple Leaf Centre for Action on Food Security, COVID-19 induced a 39% spike in overall food insecurity in Canada. As a one-time emergency stop-gap, in April, 2020 the federal government provided $100 million through the Emergency Food Security Fund. More recent spikes in the price of energy and bottlenecks in global supply chains are further exacerbating food insecurity.

The pandemic hit the hospitality and ‘experience’ economy the hardest of all sectors, of which restaurants in particular were an early and hard-hit casualty. Though many were able to pivot to online sales and home delivery, and governments have stepped in with everything from wage replacement to relaxed rules around patios, many restaurateurs and other food providers have suffered. Real GDP of the food services sector dropped by 40% in each of the first two months of the pandemic alone, while employment dropped 56% in the same period. Three quarters of food service providers have relied on government assistance to weather the pandemic storm, while many others have shuttered permanently. Some local businesses deemed by their neighbours as vital to local community prosperity were rescued through crowdfunding campaigns. Examples include Power Up and Sweaty Betty’s in Toronto and the Catoro Cafe in Vancouver.

Emergency food demand initially spiked during the early days of the pandemic, with most food banks reporting surging demand in the first month of the pandemic, but soon thereafter, there was an overall decrease in demand as government supports kicked in. The introduction of the federal CERB subsidy (later called Canada Recovery Benefit, or CRB) alongside top-ups to the Canada Child Benefit effectively served as a basic income proxy, and has lightened the food affordability burden for millions of Canadians. The Calgary Food Bank, for example, saw a 6% decline in demand attributed to the introduction of CERB.
The manner in which we produce, distribute and consume food raises many other issues with significant public importance. Open Ideo’s Food Systems Gamechangers Lab, for example, has identified 24 distinct domains where food systems can be enhanced.59 Following is a brief accounting of just a few of these issues, all of which connect to this analysis, but in less direct ways. Some would include these issues in a more generous definition of “food security”, while others argue many of these issues are distractions from the core food security issues outlined previously.

Canada’s farming population is declining. Whereas in 1931, a third of Canadians lived on a farm, fewer than 2% do now.60 The average age of farmers as of 2016 was 55, with scarcely 9% of farmers under 35.61 A number of factors are contributing to the decline of the family farm, combining to create a strong disincentive for either young people62 or diverse Canadians to enter the farming profession:

- Huge capital start-up costs and the overall precarious economic viability of farming (with net losses averaging $20,000 per farmer per year);
- The rapidly rising cost of land (over a 100% increase in land over the last 15 years)64 combined with increasing demand;
- Family farms are being sold off to large agricultural companies (“Big Ag”) or to developers or speculators;
- Tax policies regarding family farm inheritance; and
- Few investment incentives to provide farms with equity-based working capital.

As well, farming leans heavily on public subsidy and additional off-farm work, with one of every two farmers under 55 reporting off-farm employment as their main source of income.65 Ironically, farmers “still have to work off farm for the privilege of growing food.” At the same time, dependence has grown on the use of low-wage temporary foreign workers.

“Rural economies, communities, businesses, and services are also affected as there are fewer farm families to patronize local shops and services, while farmers lose their capacity to democratically influence governments and legislation as their voting numbers fall. Meanwhile, non-farmers lose their connections to farms and rural culture as fewer and fewer urban residents count farmers among their family members or friends.”

This study was done by Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives (2020).71

Farm insurance also plays into this dynamic: It is cheaper for conventional farms to provide lower nutritional quality products because the insurance is generally cheaper per unit of land (or per unit of yield) than on smaller farms with high quality products.66

Agricultural Professionals in Decline

Canada’s farming population is declining. Whereas in 1931, a third of Canadians lived on a farm, fewer than 2% do now.60 The average age of farmers as of 2016 was 55, with scarcely 9% of farmers under 35.61 A number of factors are contributing to the decline of the family farm, combining to create a strong disincentive for either young people62 or diverse Canadians to enter the farming profession:

- Huge capital start-up costs and the overall precarious economic viability of farming (with net losses averaging $20,000 per farmer per year);
- The rapidly rising cost of land (over a 100% increase in land over the last 15 years)64 combined with increasing demand;
- Family farms are being sold off to large agricultural companies (“Big Ag”) or to developers or speculators;
- Tax policies regarding family farm inheritance; and
- Few investment incentives to provide farms with equity-based working capital.

Concentration and Consolidation of Agriculture

Industrial farms are getting larger and larger, while small and medium family farms are becoming scarcer and scarcer.47 Alberta saw a 6% drop in the number of farms between the last two census periods, with about 40,000 operating farms compared with the historic high of 100,000 during World War II.48 Only about 6% of Alberta’s farms control 40% of cropland in the province.49 Industrial feedlots produce far more cattle than family-owned ranches or ranching co-ops. The landscape on the Canadian prairies, once evoking images of verdant small pastures and mixed-used farms, now more resembles Soviet-era state farming in scale. The co-authors of a recent study on farm concentration outline why this should be of concern to all Canadians:
Agri-Tech

Agricultural technologies (agri-tech or agtech) are a significant variable in human food production. The green revolution peak of the 1960s, which saw the introduction and worldwide scaling up of synthetic fertilizers, pesticides, new farm machinery and irrigation techniques, was a non-linear leap in food production. More recent advancements in hydroponics, aquaponics, genetically modified crops and technologies such as autonomous tractors and far more precise and water-conserving irrigation techniques, have increased yield, though not always the sustainability, genetic diversity or quality of food products.

Agri-tech is a particularly important industry for the Calgary region. Calgary Economic Development identifies 14 anchor agri-business firms with operations in the city investing in agri-tech, and another 22 agri-tech start-ups locally.72 The Simpson Centre for Agricultural Pride in the Calgary region. Calgary Economic Development identifies 14 anchor agri-business firms with operations in the city investing in agri-tech, and another 22 agri-tech start-ups locally.72 The Simpson Centre for Agricultural

Food Deserts

Food deserts are pockets of communities where residents have limited or no access to affordable food retail.73 In many Canadian cities low urban densities, poor planning, food distribution systems and retail economies conspire to concentrate affordable food in locations that are often well away from where people live, particularly people who are reliant on transit and walking. While some cities, such as Toronto, have excellent decentralized access to fresh, affordable produce (thanks to an abundance of historic retail spaces with affordable rent, alongside the presence of a food terminal, described later), many other cities - Calgary being a prime example - have little access to affordable produce outside large big-box retail grocers. While there is no agreed-upon definition of a ‘food desert’, recent estimates for Calgary range from 2 genuinely severe deserts to upwards of 7 for more distinct deserts, the latter taking account of winter conditions and impaired mobility.70 Two related concepts are “food swamps”, neighbourhoods where retailers providing healthy food are far outnumbered by unhealthy food options, and “food mires”, where healthy fresh food is available, say in the form of boutique natural food stores, but at a price point that is out of reach for many in the community.71

Culinary Skills and Nutritional Literacy

Despite the emergence of movements and memes like “Farm to Fork”, “Slow Food” and the “100 Mile Diet” (see Glossary, Appendix A), the cognitive connection between food on one’s plate and where and how it was grown or raised remains as tenuous as ever. But while the literacy of Canadians with respect to food preparation and nutritional knowledge may be wanting, it is a common misconception that food insecurity is partially rooted in poor shopping choices, lack of gardening skills, or a lack of food preparation and cooking skills.75 In fact, there is no discernable difference between food secure and food insecure Canadians with respect to food skills or shopping behaviour.74 Further, food insecure households are four times more likely to use a budget when procuring food.75

Food Philanthropy

Food issues are of concern to many donors, whether ‘average’ Canadian contributors or high net worth donors. In light of the relative absence of municipal government or other public authorities around downstream food security, particularly in Calgary, private philanthropy has a major default influence on the downstream food system. This is both positive, in the sense that it results in many new approaches and innovations, and negative, in the sense that it unwittingly fuels a competitive ethos and avoids or downplays systemic approaches to addressing food insecurity. But a growing number of donors are questioning whether all of this philanthropy has addressed food insecurity in any significant way.

Food Waste

One third of the world’s food shipped for consumption is wasted each year, which is enough to feed 3 billion people (with an estimated value of $1.3 trillion).74 An estimated $49 billion worth of food is wasted each year in Canada, representing 1.2 million metric tonnes in otherwise recoverable food.76 Reducing food waste can be partially addressed through redirecting food (that would otherwise go to waste) to local charities and non-profits in the form of food aid. But such a practice is fraught with allegations of indignity (there is something unseemly about the poor getting the scraps), or of food ‘dumping’ (a local variant of the critique of dumping surplus agricultural products under the guise of ‘aid’, when really it undermines local productive capacity and local markets). Many argue that food waste ought to be reduced, not simply redirected, and that we need a mindset shift away from giving our ‘Secondary Food for Secondary People’, as Tom Armitage of impact Hub Ottawa frames it.71

Food and Climate Change

Food production and consumption is both a cause of climate change, with the food system responsible for a quarter of global greenhouse gas emissions (including agriculture, land use changes to open up new farmland, refrigeration, food processing, packaging, and transport), and a casualty of climate change. As the World Resources Institute recently put it “It’s clear that agriculture as we know it simply can’t thrive in a warming world”, adding this is especially true in semi-arid areas (which is much of Southern Alberta).73 Even as population rises, climate change could reduce global food production by as much as one third by the end of the century.74 Canadians have experienced examples of this in 2021, with widespread drought on the prairies lowering yields, and floods in the Lower Mainland wiping out thousands of chickens, dairy cattle, and other animals. A recent meta-analysis of global food demand and production trends revealed that climate change could impact the severity of global hunger more than three-fold, from a projected 8% food insecure global population to an alarming 30%.76 The authors of the study conclude that “in order to prevent such impacts, increases in food production would need to be accompanied by policies and investments that promote sustainable intensification and incorporate ecological principles in agricultural systems and practices, while also reducing food loss and waste and encouraging a shift towards more plant-based diets.”

Rise of Urban Agriculture

Urban agriculture in Canada takes many forms, from community gardens to municipal orchards to urban farms, greenhouses, hydroponic and aquaponic facilities and vertical farms. While greenhouses produce a substantial and growing amount of produce in Canada, they have one key limitation - availability of sunlight for photosynthesis. But new technologies are helping fill this gap. While urban farming in indoor towers has been the stuff of science fiction for many decades, vertical farming is finally becoming a viable and even mainstream component to the mix of local producers, thanks especially to advances in LED lighting and hydroponic fluid systems. Startups like Calgary’s Deepwater Farms, NuLeaf and Ontario-based Goodleaf have seen steady growth in retailer, restaurateur, and investor interest.
Understanding Food Insecurity in Calgary

The Trends, Ecosystem and Influencers

According to the latest StatsCan survey on food security, 518,600 Albertans were experiencing food insecurity between 2015 and 2018, a number that has likely risen in the intervening years, given Alberta’s economic woes. However, Calgary was the only large city in Canada to experience a modest decline in the number of food insecure households between 2015 and 2017, consistent with broader poverty data. According to Vital Signs 2020, 33% of Calgarians struggle to afford basics like rent, utilities, and groceries, and 17% often or always struggle.”

The impact of the pandemic on Calgary’s food sector reflected trends across the country. Most Calgary businesses experienced a drop in revenues during the COVID-19 pandemic and 70% of Calgary businesses “access[ed] at least one relief program.” Hardest hit of all were restaurants.

A study of 200 low income households conducted by Vibrant Communities Calgary (VCC) and the University of Calgary revealed that the most economically marginalized Calgarians suffered the most from COVID-19’s economic fallout. The study noted that many food donation programs were temporarily shuttered due to health restrictions (also hampered by a sharp drop in volunteers), while many low income households did not apply for CERB due to lack of internet access or misunderstanding the program’s eligibility requirements.

Another recent study on Calgary’s emergency food system by VCC, conducted with the Canadian Poverty Institute, noted that the pandemic resulted in heightened demand for emergency food assistance, which in turn revealed gaps in the emergency food assistance system. However, Calgary Food Bank in reviewing its data over a similar period noted a CERB-induced drop. It is possible that these seemingly contradictory findings could be explained by the increased number of organizations that had not previously provided food aid, including human service agencies, resource centres, community associations and religious organizations, starting food hamper programs or other forms of food assistance (although some of these organizations’ food aid is also supplied or backstopped by the Food Bank). Estimates run as high as 400 organizations in Calgary that started delivering food, buoyed by both the United Way and the Calgary Foundation, which earmarked funding for food programs. This raises the question of what the role and responsibility of non-food-based social impact organizations is in contributing to a sustainable thriving food system that builds community prosperity.

On the interventions and ‘solutions’ side, the City of Calgary’s community food strategy - Calgary EATS - is now nearly a decade old, and this city of nearly 1.4 million currently dedicates only one full time municipal position to the issue of food security. The City of Calgary Neighbourhoods department has identified 35 city-wide resources and over 200 neighbourhood nodes where Calgarians can access emergency food aid, including hampers, gift cards, cooked meals, grocery delivery, bagged school lunches, pet food and other supports. Like most Canadian cities, Calgary lacks a system-wide in-school food program, instead relying on an array of mainly volunteer-run charitable food aid programs. The wide array of local emergency food resources (many of which are highlighted in Appendix D) results in competition and duplication, which is undoubtedly confusing from the standpoint of the food-insecure Calgarian. It is also confusing for private funders who want to move the dial on food insecurity. At the same time, 45% of Calgarians last year reported growing their own food, a big jump from 37% the previous year.

While many Canadian cities have readily identifiable “food sheds”, like Toronto’s connection to the Ontario Greenbelt or Vancouver’s connection to the lower mainland, Salish Sea and Okanagan, Calgary’s “food shed” is more difficult to define. On one level, discovering a true “food shed” in an era of global supply chains is a bit like chasing the end of a rainbow. On the other hand, farmers’ markets are a way to discern what the food shed might be, insofar as “local” purchasing and consumption is a component of overall consumption. A food for thought section later in this report digs deeper into the different perceptions of “local” put forward by community stakeholders attached to the YV Local Food Distribution Hub.

Discovering a true ‘food shed’ in an era of global supply chains is a bit like chasing the end of a rainbow.
The YYC Local Food Distribution Hub

Food hubs are a way to bridge upstream and downstream food security, supporting the regional agricultural value chain through relationships with local farmers and other producers.

A Case Study

Food hubs are a way to bridge upstream and downstream food security, supporting the regional agricultural value chain through relationships with local farmers and other producers, while at the same time supporting local access, small retailers and affordable consumption. However, there are many ‘flavours’ of food hubs worldwide, from industrial scale food distribution centres to grassroots community food centres. Virtually all definitions of food hubs place emphasis on a local or regional focus, in the growing, processing, and distributing of the food item. Their primary purpose is typically to increase market access, and lower distribution costs, for small and medium local or regional producers.

The YYC Local Food Distribution Hub is a pilot initiative that brings together local producers (family-operated farms and ranches typically focused on more humane, more sustainable practices than industry-wide standards) with nonprofit organizations (typically charities focused on alleviating downstream food insecurity, though through a variety of means). By bringing these groups together, along with a committee of advisory members, The YYC Local Food Distribution Hub sought to test whether the transportation, warehousing and distribution components of the food supply chain could be a fruitful leverage point for positive system-wide change.

“Being a farm to fork business, we spend the majority of time producing and packaging the food. We don’t have time to run around and deliver. I would love to join a group that takes some of the distribution side of things off my hands.”

— Producer Participant

Food Hubs: A Global Lens

A food hub is an entity that works within a specific region with a targeted focus on one or more components of the food value chain. As noted in the Food Hub Business Assessment Toolkit, “The term ‘food hub’ emerged in the last decade to describe alternative food aggregation, distribution, and processing enterprises that began developing or expanding within regions across the [United States]. These enterprises sought to fill gaps in infrastructure to move food from farms to consumers within the same region.”

Food hubs provide some insurance against the vulnerabilities (as well as nutritional, diversity, and flavour compromises) attached to global supply chains. They typically place strong emphasis on helping producers maximize local markets and value-added opportunities, at the same time helping retailers, restaurateurs and consumers understand food origins (i.e. “Where does my food come from?”). As such, food hubs sometimes build in traceability provisions into the local supply chain. Many food hub variants engaged in downstream food access and affordability also emphasize dignity of consumption and de-stigmatizing food access for those experiencing food insecurity.
Food Hubs are increasingly common in the United States, with 221 listed in the online Hub Directory as of October, 2021.101 Food Hubs are increasingly common in the United States, with 221 listed in the online Hub Directory as of October, 2021.101 Organizations in the USA have also contributed significantly to research on food hubs, including the National Food Hub Survey most recently re-run in 2019.102

The Role of Food Hubs

Within the literature on food hubs, there are a number of defining common characteristics, and the categories that resonated with the YYC Local Food Distribution Hub can be grouped into five categories. These categories build upon a robust 2011 framework of food hubs by Horst et al., which aimed to provide some clarity about what defines food hubs.107 These categories remain useful, despite the intervening decade of food hub development.

The five categories, which inform the structure of the subsequent sections of this report, can be summarized as the spark - who leads the hub, the structure - the legal identity and governance of the hub, the job - who leads the hub, the spark - what it hopes to achieve, and the purpose - what it hopes to achieve, and the stage - how far along it is. Exploring these characteristics helps to compare the YYC model to other Food Hubs and to ensure that current and future assessments are comparing ‘apples to apples’. Using these markers, the YYC Local Food Distribution Hub can be described as a funder-driven start-up distribution hub with a cooperative core and a focus on economic and social impact.

Archetypical Food Hub

Food Hubs in Canada

While the United States is further ahead than Canada in the development of food hubs, nearly every province and territory in Canada has either an entity or program with the title of ‘Food Hub’, or at least has explored the concept. And interest is growing. The British Columbia Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries earlier this year, for example, announced $5.6 million in funding to the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries earlier this year, for example, announced $5.6 million in funding to create 12 food hubs across the province, adding to the 12 food hubs already operating in Vancouver, Port Alberni, and Surrey.103 Food terminals and other distribution nodes, Community Supported Agriculture programs (CSAs), community food centres, and even farmers’ markets are variously referred to as food hubs. Because of this sheer diversity and complexity, it is important to delve deeply into the specifics of each hub when looking for other examples to learn from. Refer to Appendix D for some examples of food hubs in Canada and elsewhere that may be particularly instructive.
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While it is important to establish points of comparison to learn from other food hubs, it is not always straightforward to evaluate the success of one food hub by comparing it with another. Many sources have noted the context-specific journey of food hubs. As one observer clearly stated “no single measurement can be applied to all food hubs, as each must be measured by its success or failure in achieving its own underlying goals.”

The YYC Local Food Distribution Hub: Prototype, Pilot, and Pivot

Started in 2020, at the height of the global COVID-19 pandemic, the YYC Local Food Distribution Hub is both funded and led by the YYC Food Security Fund, a venture-based philanthropic initiative of local change-maker Zai Mamdani. The Fund’s activities are facilitated through Place2Give Foundation, which brokers connections between donors and social change efforts.

A Venture Philanthropy Approach

YYC Food Security Fund is an example of venture philanthropy. Venture philanthropy, sometimes also called philanthrocapitalism, is an approach first coined by John D. Rockefeller which later gained huge traction alongside the tech boom and the rise of silicon valley philanthropists. It applies concepts and techniques from venture capital finance, business management, and/or entrepreneurial lenses and techniques, and rapidly iterating, prototyping, and pivoting on the fly. A criticism of many venture philanthropy approaches is a tendency to overlook systemic factors (underlying dynamics or root causes). Notably, however, the YYC Fund Security Fund is interested in understanding and helping address the systemic issues facing Calgary’s food security challenges, which is one of the reasons this report was commissioned.

The Seed of the Idea: The Genesis of The YYC Food Security Project

Guided by business owners, philanthropists, community activists, farmers, ranchers and producers, the YYC Food Security Fund seeks to support the local economy by paying fair market value to local producers and farmers and infusing those products into the local business community for distribution into the consumer base. The YYC Food Security Fund aims to create a buffer for the food industry by purchasing locally sourced and locally produced foodstuffs at fair market value.

The food system is complex and multi-layered, with ill-defined boundaries, thousands of direct stakeholders in all sectors of society, and an absence of general agreement on the measures required to improve food access, affordability, or sustainability. This complexity is what Design Theorist, Horst Rittel would call a “wicked problem”. The journey of the YYC Local Food Distribution Hub, and its affiliated projects and partners, represents a case study in making an intervention at a key leverage point within this system, with the aim of inducing positive change. This intervention is also designed to respond to real-time community and stakeholder feedback, this report being one example of how this feedback is captured and disseminated.

The YYC Food Security Project

The journey of the YYC Local Food Distribution Hub, and its affiliated projects and partnerships, represents a case study in making an intervention at a key leverage point within this system, with the aim of inducing positive change.

Despite still being in its youth – scarcely one year from inception – the initiative has already experienced many iterations, design pivots, implementation improvements, and other course corrections. The founder-philanthropist in this case was comfortable with “failing forward”, which enabled nimble shifts without having to go through a full testing cycle before making the decision to change. This meant that as a social venture, this started out as one thing, then became another, then became another. It will continue to make pivots and adjustments as both the broader food system context shifts, and as the mutual trust and depth of knowledge between the stakeholders - producers, purchasers/service providers, advisors and others - grows and deepens.

While community stakeholders were excited about the overall potential of the Food Hub (as well as complementary initiatives that might over time be supported through the YYC Food Security Fund), there were also a significant number of questions and critiques about the project. The following pages chart the journey of the Food Hub pilot with some of the noted strengths and challenges highlighted in a series of Food for Thought sections.
Project Timeline

September 2020
YYC Food Security Fund conversations begin

October 2020
First Food Security roundtable meeting

March-April 2021
Initial idea of a food distribution hub emerges; focus on restaurants more than food charities

May 2021
Establishing process and framework; original distributor withdraws and YYC Growers steps in as distributor

June-July 2021
Community stakeholder interviews

June 2021
Reflections and preparation for orders

July 2021
Phase 1 Pilot Official Kick-Off

August 2021
Pause for reflection and assessment

September 2021
Transition into Phase 2

Over the past year, the initial visionaries, a philanthropist aided by a group of advisors, have shown the importance of flexibility when it comes to systems-level work involving many individuals and organizations (most of whom had previously not known or worked with each other). While the mission of the fund—improving access to food security context—is a unique approach with the potential to succeed where other attempts had failed. Creating a food hub was not a new idea or phenomenon in Alberta; The YYC Local Food Distribution Hub joined Edmonton’s food hub, The Public, and the Leduc Food Processing Development Centre. However, opinions differ on whether 2021 was the first time a food hub was pitched or explored in Calgary - and one’s view of the YYC Food Hub as a new idea depends largely on one’s definition of a food hub. Regardless, the direct funder involvement in the YYC Food Hub was viewed as a unique approach with the potential to succeed where other attempts had failed.

Growing Conditions: Building the Food Hub Model

After early exploratory meetings, the members of the YYC Food Security Advisory Committee formally met for the first time in October 2020. Most of the participants were brought into the partnership by a previous connection to another participant. The group sought to leverage existing networks, and a benefit of the venture philanthropist origins of this project provided the opportunity to access and communicate with funder/donor networks.

The word-of-mouth recruitment strategy, built on pre-established connections, helped to build trust among participants, which is essential to effective collaboration. Interviewees noted a hesitation among both producers and charities who had been “burned” in the past and were wary of putting themselves out there for yet another experimental project, the destiny of which was, and remains, unwritten. Additionally, there had not been a previous buyer-seller relationship between most of the producers and charities involved. While producers noted they often donated produce to charities, and charities tried to source locally when they could, albeit on an ad hoc basis (with only one exception), this pilot marked the first time members of both groups had pursued a relationship on this scale. This meant the pilot was all the more risky based on this lack of previous connection, although many stayed committed and optimistic solely because they trusted at least one other member.

Growing the membership was not a challenge during the first phase of the project and many were engaged to chronicle food hub development and broader food security context. Feedback from the pilot indicated theYYC Growers steps in as distributor. YYC Food Security Fund to financially support charities’ participation in the project. Two big impetuses for the YYC Food Security Fund’s inception was to find ways to ensure individuals could “Dine with Dignity” and to ensure that local producers find stable and growing markets for their products. An Advisory Committee was struck to explore options and act on this goal. As the group connected with their networks, they set up meetings with farmers, ranchers, restaurateurs and other value-added producers to better understand the barriers regional producers face in the market. This initial approach was consistent with recommendations from literature on food activism about where to begin. The producer stakeholders noted limited access to market, unpredictable demand, and regulatory burdens as major concerns for smaller farmers, dynamics that a food hub could help address. The idea of a food hub was pitched by one of the producers early on, and was initially positioned as an option to bridge the gap between producers and restaurants, which experienced severe early hardship as a result of COVID-19, as outlined earlier in this report. The group later saw an opportunity to leverage the YYC Food Security Fund to financially support charities’ participation in the project.

Creating a food hub was not a new idea or phenomenon in Alberta; The YYC Local Food Distribution Hub joined Edmonton’s food hub, The Public, and the Leduc Food Processing Development Centre. However, opinions differ on whether 2021 was the first time a food hub was pitched or explored in Calgary - and one’s view of the YYC Food Hub as a new idea depends largely on one’s definition of a food hub. Regardless, the direct funder involvement in the YYC Food Hub was viewed as a unique approach with the potential to succeed where other attempts had failed.

“Do think consumers like to see local. But it’s not easy to get - that’s the problem. Big box stores only cater to local if it’s convenient. They want to order it from one place with one truck and one invoice.”

— Community Stakeholder (producer)
Food For Thought: Membership & Equity

Both Food Hub members and external stakeholders expressed a desire to increase not only the overall number of members in the project, but also the diversity of membership. There was a preference to start with a small number of participants in the YYC pilot, both to more quickly build trust and to keep things manageable, though relying on word-of-mouth recruitment processes can result in the re-privileging of groups who already benefit from the current system. One community stakeholder noted that they were “a little baffled and disappointed by the people [they saw] around the table,” emphasizing that the project was an opportunity in particular for smaller producers to get new exposure. While the Hub pilot proponents did reach out to some Indigenous, Black, People of Colour, same-sex couples, and women in farming communities, those who “generally have less access to opportunities, resources, and systems of power because of their actual or perceived identity or identities.” This would include suppliers (producers), buyers (charities), and advisors that are led by groups such as Indigenous, Black, People of Colour, 2SLGBTQ+, immigrants, or people with disabilities.

On the producer side, as the Racial Equity Implementation Guide for Food Hubs notes, “The failure to center racial equity and other progressive values in food hub business models invites the replication of the logic and damaging practices of the mainstream food system.” Many historic and current barriers make it difficult for equity seeking communities to access land for farming, let alone devote time to the networking, marketing, and promotions that would give them the visibility and connections needed to participate in an initiative like the YYC Food Hub. Without a focus on representation, those that do not fit the dominant narrative of the male-led, white family farm, would likely be overlooked during recruitment.

As mentioned previously, the history of upstream food security is intricately basted by the project of colonization. While there are some modest efforts on the prairies aimed at supporting indigenous-led agriculture, every initiative that seeks to improve food systems has an obligation to explore how it can decolonize its practice and commit to reconciliation.

It is also challenging for newer Canadians to get into farming. Since 2007, farmland prices in Canada have increased by over 100%. With land prices continuing to soar, and with farmland squeezed by exurban development, urban sprawl, climate-related challenges, plus factoring in the capital cost of farm startup and the economic risks attached to small production, there are multiple barriers to entering farming as a profession for newer Canadians, which means that farming remains overwhelmingly a Euro-Canadian pursuit. Additionally, the challenges farmers with a physical and/or mental disability face are significant and not well known or understood, which makes maintaining farmland and accessing supports difficult. Although there is increasing acceptance of the growing number of 2SLGBTQ+ individuals engaging in farming in Canada, there is still work to be done to ensure their full inclusion in agriculture. Each of these groups, to name just a few dimensions of diversity, would likely benefit from participating in a collaboration like the Food Hub, though it is vital to create space for these individuals and groups to lead and assert how they want their own needs to be best included.

Meanwhile, on the buyer side, food movements in Canada are often viewed as elitist, expensive, and defining success as either profit or environmental impact even if it was not a priority. This means that smaller, local producers, the target beneficiaries of this project, are viewed as generally more willing to pay a premium for environmental impact than they are for profitability, and are the social impacts of the triple bottom line of that production. Many community stakeholders stated that a measurable, even if minor, financial benefit for farmers was their main measure of success. Social impact was the second priority, which included improved food quality for charities, improved trust between the players, and the ability for charities to go to one vendor rather than several suppliers.

Sewing Support: Establishing Shared Values and Goals

The purpose of the YYC Local Food Distribution Hub and the impact it aimed to achieve at the time of writing can be broken down into three broad categories: Economic impact, social impact, and environmental impact. The responses from community stakeholders about which areas of impact they saw as a potential outcome of the Food Hub were heavily focused on values that reflected an improved economic impact for producers, with some elements of social benefits. Many community stakeholders stated that it was a measurable, even if minor, financial benefit for farmers was their main measure of success. Social impact was the second priority, which included improved food quality for charities, improved trust between the players, and the ability for charities to go to one vendor rather than several suppliers.

Although environmental impact was rarely explicitly mentioned when participants were asked about the value of the YYC Food Hub, a small number of stakeholders were extremely passionate about the sustainability focus as an outcome. One participant noted that a focus on improved ecological impact would be their main measure of success in the development of the project, but others felt it was paramount. Rod Olson of YYC Growers and Distributors, suggested the environment is often not considered in food charity and challenged how “we stand on the soil and treat it like dirt.” A further complication was that the project would create a positive environmental impact even if it was not a priority. This is because smaller, local producers, the target beneficiaries of this project, are viewed as generally more sustainable in their practices and impact, irrespective of whether they had consciously decided to integrate sustainability principles and practices.

“[The Hub] is in a perfect alignment in that it models everything that we teach and preach here. It models our good food principles; it matters where food comes from, how it was produced, who it was produced by [and] what are the social impacts of the triple bottom line of that production.”

— Community Stakeholder

Further, when determining what ‘being successful’ meant for the Food Hub pilot, as one community stakeholder aptly stated, “everyone has a different idea of what success looks like.” These differing expectations were not all mutually exclusive. At this stage in the pilot there was a general consensus to try things out, though there were points of tension in how participants would prioritize the outcomes.

“‘The value system. That’s the common denominator. This whole project is kind of based on values: keeping that family farm alive, the quality, the availability, and supporting charities.’”

— Community Stakeholder

Many hoped that all participants would gain an increased awareness of place of origin and produce seasonality, thereby choosing to purchase items well within the Calgary foodshed, and in season, and reduce the distance products had to travel. Additionally, while some community stakeholders believed the growing options in Alberta were limited, supporting multiple smaller producers would actually demonstrate (and contribute to) the diversity of crops that can be grown locally.
Food For Thought: What is “Local”?

What does it mean for something to be local? As one community stakeholder noted, “that’s a really loaded question.” Every community stakeholder contacted in compiling this report felt that “local” was an important priority when talking about food security in Calgary. Many define success for the pilot as increased access to nutritious local food. However, nearly every person had a unique definition of what “local” actually means. Definitions generally fit into six broad categories, though there are likely more perspectives than what has been captured here.

Regional - within specific boundaries
Contextual - depends on the food item in question
Comparative - anything closer than the current source as a baseline comparison

Relational - having a relationship with the grower, regardless of geography
Legal - defined by a regulation or certification body
Capacity: Size - within a certain size of production - i.e. a small family farm being “local” vs. a larger commercial ag operation

Which definition participants use affects their expectations for how the food hub will operate and what success will look like. It also has a twofold impact on membership. Not only will certain members decide to join based on how it fits with their view of a ‘local’ initiative; it will also influence critiques and questions about why certain players have not been brought into the project.

The Case of BC Produce: Alluring Fruit

A common question was whether BC fruit could be considered ‘local’ and if BC producers could be brought into the partnership. While it is not impossible to grow fruit in Calgary, despite prolific myths to the contrary, it is less challenging for our neighbours to the west. Members with a regional definition of local often stated that BC fruit was off the table and we should promote seasonality and the fruits that can grow in Calgary. Meanwhile, members with relational or contextual definitions, to name a few, would permit BC produce as long as there was a relationship with the farmer or it was not possible to source the item any closer. These differing definitions, visualized in the graphic above, created tensions about who to include in the pilot.

From our conversations, it appears that an individual’s definition of local is highly context specific and influenced by what they see as the benefits of local. For example, definitions of local were often followed by a rationale for their words. For example, purchasing locally means the producer and buyer can often have more flexibility. These relationships were especially beneficial during the pandemic when the needs of organizations were shifting constantly. Alternatively, it was often stated that local was less carbon intensive - though the truth of this concept was challenged by both our community stakeholders and the literature. While many suggest that fewer kilometres travelled means less fuel will be used, the increased efficiency and scale of large operations often results in fewer emissions than local food-supply chain models. Because of these and other perceptions, it is therefore much more challenging to come to a consensus on messaging and the ‘why’ of going local.

At the YYC Food Security Fund Advisory table, which trickled down to the Food Hub collective, the definition of local that was chosen was a (roughly) three hour driving distance of Calgary. This allowed for access to ranches and farms as far south as Lethbridge and as far north as Leduc. While discussion around the “true” borders of Calgary’s food shed continues, for the pilot it was felt that working with producers and suppliers closer to the city was easier to manage than moving further afield.

Finding Sunshine: Going Public and Soaking up Feedback

As the YYC Food Hub pilot began testing and rolling out its ordering process with an initial group of eight nonprofit organizations (all but one of which are also registered charities) and twelve producers, the Advisory group continued to reflect on their progress and assess where the project might need to pivot. The Institute for Community Prosperity began meeting with identified stakeholders, and there was an ongoing cycle of feedback and checking in on external perceptions. As more people learned of the YYC Food Hub, existing challenges were re-examined and new issues were brought to light.

Pilot Successes

Participants in the pilot liked the quality of food, the quality of producers involved, learning more about the range of food charities in the community, the option of having a new sales and distribution channel to access local food, as well as the elevated awareness of local farmers. Some even commented on the novelty of food they had not previously encountered being made available, which challenged some charities - in a good way - to try new recipes. The unique nature of the project was also identified as a strength and, if successful, would fulfill one of the actions in CalgaryEATS around institutional procurement.

A Dignified Alternative

One widely shared highlight of the YYC Food Hub noted early in the project was that it is an ennobled (albeit pricier) alternative to giving unwanted food or food waste to the most vulnerable. One community stakeholder plainly captured the current state of food charity: “because you’re poor, you don’t get fresh, you get whatever the rest of the system doesn’t want.” While food waste is a significant resource drain and blight on our society, as noted earlier, food waste should ultimately be prevented in the first place rather than redirected to our most vulnerable. By adding opportunities for local producers to sell fresh products to charities, the clients served by these agencies receive fresh items rather than any unsellable or salvaged foods.

“[The challenge for the hub is] you can’t overcharge the charity but you can’t underpay the farmer.”

– Community Stakeholder
Further, some questioned how the food hub was valuable if the end consumer, in this case an individual accessing a charity, did not actually know they were eating better or local food. Community stakeholders were in strong agreement that the value of sourcing local was not dependent on the end user recognizing or appreciating the change in their food. Instead, many suggested that it was about the principle of improving food quality and access, and some believed the food would speak for itself in terms of increased quality. Still others felt that community education could be a critical part of the next phase of the Fund’s work and investment.

Throughout the interviewing process, and especially as the initial ordering pilot came to a close, questions about the sustainability of the model became more urgent. Ever since charities were first posed as the main or only buyers of the hub, there were concerns about if and how the hub could become self-sufficient. While the social impact of improving access to nutritious, fresh food remained a priority, the economic reality made the group reflect on how they might shift to remain viable. This tension highlights that food hubs “require a different investment mindset.” The food hub model is difficult to maintain, especially if it is mainly relying on funders rather than buyers. The initial hub model envisioned restaurants and other businesses as the targeted buyers, rather than a program that relies on charities (who require a deep philanthropic subsidy to make the food competitive with their other suppliers). A hybrid model, where philanthropy combines with for-profit buyers, could subsidize some participants while opening up the market to local food more broadly. The Common Market network of food hubs in the US for example (see Appendix D) uses net revenue generated from commercial sales to subsidize charities and other downstream community food groups to purchase food at cost, while farm-to-table is focused on increased quality. At the time of our discussions, many doubted the viability of the concept if non-charities would not be able to purchase from the hub.

Many community stakeholders were excited about the Food Hub concept, but also suggested that ultimately it was only making things marginally better for too few people in an otherwise broken system.

Is an Alternative Distribution System Sufficient? Systems Change?

There is growing evidence of the systemic nature of food security, and the need for states/governments to take action at scale. While food hubs have proven effective at building a stronger bridge between upstream and downstream food security, one significant challenge all food hubs face is in catalyzing more fundamental system-wide change. Charities focused food interventions of all kinds also face the challenge of demonstrating how they are not simply relieving hunger, but ending it. The scale and nature of non-profit interventions, even if community-wide, is a perennial challenge, in no way unique to the YYC Food Hub. As one community stakeholder noted, drawing a parallel to the social change challenge of eliminating racism, “there isn’t anyone saying stay hungry, chip away; we’ll get rid of racism in another 50 years.”

The YYC Food Hub intentionally started with a small scale pilot, because it was a test of a concept. Many community stakeholders were excited about this pilot, but some also suggested that ultimately it was only making things marginally better for a small number of people in an otherwise broken system. Others, though, were emphatic in their belief that the Hub was focusing on the wrong level for change, and encouraged the Fund to target wider policy-oriented solutions either instead of, or in addition to, the Hub.

These challenges reflect the critiques in the literature on food hubs and other similar food movements. As one source succinctly noted, “food hubs alone cannot change industry norms and practices, and can even aid the food industry in maintaining the status quo.” Yet food hubs can create change; their approach to change is in the value of demonstration, as a practical alternative to radically opposing the status quo. There are a variety of ways individuals and organizations can approach changing the food system, as well-documented and summarized in the book Civil Society and Social Movements in Food System Governance. The YYC Food Hub can be labeled as an alternative that is in parallel to the dominant food system rather than deconstructing our existing food system. Particularly so if it continues to build and be guided by a participatory model. YYC Growers, one of the partners in the Food Hub and the organization responsible for the distribution component of the hub, has been identified as one example of a successful Alternative Food Network. This provides some reassurance that the Food Hub model has potential in Calgary.

Pilot Challenges

The pilot cost the YYC Food Security Fund $12,000 over the six week period. However, it yielded only $2,700 in total orders/sales (roughly $600/week). Even considering social side benefits like trust-building and awareness-raising, this is still a pretty negative opening return on investment. On the other hand, it is almost unheard of for any business to turn a profit in its first month. Part of the reason that charities in the pilot ordered so little food was the sheer cost; Local sustainably-produced food is simply much more expensive per unit cost than bulk-purchased supermarket food from global supply chains. As one community stakeholder noted, the pilot was caught in the tension between “You can’t overcharge the charity but you can’t underprice the farmer.”

Also, charities have existing distribution channels that they didn’t want to disrupt for the sake of an experimental approach, so all of them are understandably ‘dipping a toe’ rather than ‘diving in’. It is not easy to switch to a new supply regime absent greater certainty about the long term viability of the model. As well, the purchasing decisions of each charity are not in all cases the domain of the representative who has been at the table, and more likely to ‘buy in’ to the model. It is also challenging to create trust in a short time, at the table, and more likely to ‘buy in’ to the model. It is not easy to switch to a new supply regime, as was the case for the YYC Food Hub when it initiated a pilot period with YYC Food Security Fund.

食品系统也是脆弱的，正如我们在全球范围内观察到的恶劣天气所表明的那样。然而，目前的食品系统仍然存在弱点，因为它的脆弱性导致了各种中断。许多人认为，这是全球供应链的局势因在社区中发生。例如， YYC资助者，其中的一个合作伙伴，质疑了这一模型的可行性，并提出了一个替代方案，该方案结合了慈善机构和非营利机构的购买力，而不是一个依赖于非营利机构的模型。在这一点上，YYC资助者对这一模型持积极态度，因为它是一个用自己支付的款项完成的试验。许多参与食品安全项目的研究人员也相信，该模型是朝着更广泛的政策解决方案迈出的一步，而不是试图取代食品银行，而是作为“补丁”解决方案的一部分，包括其他食品中心，作为最终解决方案的一部分，包括其他食品中心，作为最终解决方案的一部分。无论是与食品银行的比较，还是与“食品系统”解决方案的比较，都表明该基金应该在下一阶段的工作中提高其质量。
Food for Thought: How Funding Policy and Advocacy Can Make a Difference

Many of the system-level changes necessary to achieving both upstream and downstream food security require action (and spending) by government. However, many registered charities have historically been reluctant to engage in public policy advocacy. Helpfully, there are no longer regulatory limits on the amount of public policy work a charity is permitted, so long as that work is non-partisan and consistent with the organization’s broader charitable objectives. This is true also for foundations, who are increasingly being urged to fund advocacy, policy, and systems-change efforts. So, for example, if an organization is aiming to relieve hunger, it may also devote resources toward advocating for policies that strengthen downstream food security. Although there are also rules governing lobbying (direct engagement of public officials with intent to change or retain policy), both at the federal and provincial level, the vast majority of public policy work is not only permitted, but is an expected and essential role of civil society.

Despite this, most charities do not engage in public policy work, preferring to focus on community-based initiatives sometimes to the exclusion of macro-level systems change. Some organizations may be hampered by a culture that spurns systems-level work, or may simply have a policy-averse board. For many others it is difficult to justify redirecting resources to policy work when there are food insecure clients walking through the doors of the organization, and all hands are needed for this emergent and urgent task. Even when food-focused charities are aware of systems-level dynamics that exacerbate food insecurity, and the policy steps that could be taken to dramatically improve food security, it is still relatively uncommon for this to translate into policy engagement (either directly or via a coalition). For example, according to Food Banks Canada, only 25% of food banks in Canada engage in any form of policy work. As another example, in Calgary 25% of food banks in Canada engage in any form of policy work, or may simply have a policy-averse board. But many others it is difficult to justify redirecting resources to policy work when there are food insecure clients walking through the doors of the organization, and all hands are needed for this emergent and urgent task. Even when food-focused charities are aware of systems-level dynamics that exacerbate food insecurity, and the policy steps that could be taken to dramatically improve food security, it is still relatively uncommon for this to translate into policy engagement (either directly or via a coalition).

It would also be naïve not to acknowledge how difficult policy advocacy can be - especially for something as ambitious as, say, universal basic income. Even as charities develop more of a social justice-orientation, and even with the former regulatory barriers removed, advocacy directed at governments can still be a slow, incrementally daunting mountain to climb. As one community stakeholder added, “It takes courage, it’s a courageous move. To go after income because you are going after a totally contested area. You will be beat up on. You invite all the stereotypes, hostility, all the taxpayer (advocacy groups), the partisanship. So even to take a stand on it is to invite attack.”

A Mixed Harvest: Pausing for Reflection and Early Pivots

After the pilot had completed its initial commitment of six weeks of orders, the group paused to assess their work to date and decide on course corrections. The project leads met with the charities and producers separately to compile feedback.

In terms of the process, the pilot was generally deemed a success, and participants were excited about continuing on, albeit with some tweaks and adjustments. Almost $3,000 in new dollars was directed from charities into the local food system and YYC Growers were able to expand their business to include a wholesale component. On the other hand, the pilot ordering process revealed a reluctance or inability on the part of charities to fundraise for systems-level action, including advocacy and policy work. Other funders are also more likely to be open to supporting policy work if they see a peer foundation making these investments.

A hidden value was in the connections that were made between agencies and the opportunity to share ideas and collaborate. As noted in our meetings with conversation participants, it was beneficial for participants to build relationships with one another. Participants learned about how each charity looks at, uses, and sources food (i.e. while local, fresh food was a clear benefit, unprocessed food added an extra cost to the charities). Simultaneously, participants expand their understanding of how producers plan for, prepare, and bring their food to the market. The group also confirmed their need to have a broader customer base and re-think what it means to be a food hub.

A hidden value was in the connections that were made between agencies and the opportunity to share ideas and collaborate... Participants learned about how each charity looks at, uses, and sources food.
Food for Thought: COVID Impact on the Hub

The literature has many examples of how to best structure and manage a food hub,\(^{104}\) including some that have tried to learn from closures of prior food hub initiatives.\(^ {104}\) While some learnings are starting to emerge in writings about food hubs that include COVID-19,\(^ {103}\) this is an opportunity to contribute to this learning by shining a light on how the pandemic has profoundly affected the YYC Food Hub.

While it did not directly cause the spark that led to this project, COVID-19 has effectively shone a light on the issue of food security,\(^ {105}\) and it appears—despite many challenges—COVID contributed in some ways to the YYC Food Hub’s success. More people saw or experienced food shortages, and as one community stakeholder noted, food insecurity could no longer be ignored as something that happened to other people.\(^ {101}\) Suddenly many more millions of Canadians were a paycheck away from having to access emergency food assistance. The relationship between income and food access in this light became harder to ignore.

Additionally, there have been other initiatives who have struggled or disbanded where the YYC Food Hub managed to persevere. Some interviewees suggested that the dedicated funder involvement in this project was the key ingredient to success, yet it is also likely that all participants and stakeholders are more aware of the urgency of the problem and have remained committed despite challenges that could have easily ended this pilot. As one stated, “[the YYC Food Hub] was the right idea at the right time [and COVID played a part].”\(^ {103}\)

The producers’ pandemic experience appears to have been largely positive, from an economic standpoint. COVID increased the risks producers were already facing, and investment in this project was a clear opportunity to weather the pandemic. However, nearly all of the producer community stakeholders said COVID actually helped their business because local consumers started buying more from farms directly, or through farmers markets. There are a number of possible reasons for the shifts in purchasing, including changes in values to support local, or concerns about perceived\(^ {106}\) or actual shortages of food from disrupted supply chains.\(^ {104}\) Avenues to market like the YYC Food Hub may become increasingly important if consumers shift back to their pre-pandemic purchasing habits.

The participation of charities and sustainability of the financial model was a challenge. While charities also showed resilience while responding to COVID, they have not been able to support the project as much as they would have liked. Funders often exclude food in the permitted use of their funds (except for a short time during COVID),\(^ {104}\) and the existing struggles charities have in buying food make it difficult to pay even higher costs for local food. Without continued subsidies from funders or additional non-charity buyers, the financial model would be unsustainable. While many community stakeholders hoped that funders might start to provide more funding for food services, it seems like COVID’s impacts on the direct provision of funding for food will be short-lived.

Additionally, COVID-19 also exacerbated timing challenges the pilot would have likely experienced even in non-pandemic times. The peak growing season in Alberta coincides with a reduction in services or shift to summer programming for charities, summer breaks for schools, and vacation time for most of the community stakeholders participating other than the producers. COVID-19 made this pilot even more difficult because the charities were not running at peak operational capacity, many staff are facing emotional or actual burnout because vacation time is so difficult to take, and programming faces unpredictability in having to adapt to new or changing COVID restrictions.

With these factors in mind, the YYC Food Hub pilot has achieved an impressive feat. The difficulties created or worsened by COVID-19 may provide the Food Hub with the resilience it needs to weather the complexities and challenges of improving food security in Calgary.

“COVID demonstrated that food intersects everything”

— Audra Stevenson, Leftovers Foundation

Rotating the Crops: What’s Next

Although the YC Local Food Distribution Hub has made some important early adjustments, there are four more fundamental pivots that collectively might be called “Phase Two” of the Hub: 1. Equity investment to scale YYC Growers; 2. Pay-what-you-want food markets; 3. Public dialogue, education and awareness-raising; and 4. Advocacy / public policy work. The YYC Food Security Fund is investing in each of these initiatives, which are in different stages of design and planning.

“We feel like the food conversation needs to be networked into the community in a dramatic way. That’s the disruption the food world is waiting for.”

— Rod Olson, YYC Growers and Distributors

1. Equity Investment to Scale YYC Growers

One clear opportunity is for the cooperative YYC Growers, which already operates in many respects as a food hub, to simply scale up their operations, both in terms of numbers of upstream producers and diversity and range of downstream community partners. However, the ‘closed-loop’ nature of the charitable system (charitable dollars must always be used for charitable purposes) limits the range of options available to a philanthropy-tied food hub model.\(^ {157}\) As such, the YYC Food Security Fund is exploring options of impact investment with YYC Growers.

3. Public Dialogue, Education, and Awareness-Raising

Public knowledge of food security is lacking, as is awareness of the innovations and solutions available to address both upstream and downstream food security. There are many fruitful opportunities to enhance community education on food security. Many of the partners already at the table as part of the YYC Food Hub either already provide community learning programs, such as the Alex Community Food Centre, or are very interested in expanding food literacy and systems-level knowledge of food security. This initiative is in its earliest planning stages, and may involve one or more organizations (TBD) working independently or in partnership. Winnipeg’s Fireweed Food Hub, for example, envisions a central space for consumers and producers to connect and gain access to learn about food security, as well as broader food education. This is similar to how community food centres operate—providing information on community gardens and kitchens, for example, as well as tackling the key issue addressed by Young Agrarians—attracting and supporting a new generation of farmers and other local producers. Nourish, an alliance of practitioners trying to build understanding of the “complex relationships between Indigenous foodways, reconciliation, healing, and health care”, partly through learning journeys and webinars, employs an educational approach based on four principles: Systems-based, place-based, history-informed and awareness-focused.\(^ {160}\) There are also many possible avenues for post-secondary institutes and help students find and forge learning pathways around food security. The UBC Farm / Centre for Sustainable Food Systems is particularly instructive.\(^ {160}\)
4. Advocacy / Public Policy Work

This report has discussed advocacy and public policy work in previous sections, and the final section of the report outlines potential actions for all three levels of government. An important role of philanthropy in general, and of the YYC Food Security Fund in particular, is to help ‘de-risk’ policy innovation by undertaking or commissioning research, seeding demonstration projects, financing community-driven outcomes purchasing, or convening coalitions of funders in shared strategic investments. Examples of this latter approach include the Ontario Greenbelt Foundation and the Great Bear Rainforest initiative, both of which began with philanthropy, then were leveraged manyfold by both government funding and legislation. The YYC Food Security Fund has indicated a clear intention to engage in advocacy and policy work, but the focus and strategy is to be determined.

Conversely, if you put all the emphasis on agile development (sometimes called “rapid prototyping” or “move fast, fail forward”) – trying different small-scale interventions and learning on the fly – this can be energizing for all involved, and can yield valuable context-specific insights. It also syncs well with the urgency of the issue of food insecurity: if we don’t at least get going and try new approaches, we’ll never know. But, this rapid approach can end up causing more harm than good (without a deeper understanding of the problem) and can frustrate people who are part of one rapidly prototyped experiment, but then find themselves on the outside in the next iteration. Additionally, without scanning the landscape of existing interventions, and being clear why an existing community approach could not be adapted or scaled to fit, it is often tempting to start a new organization (also because there are few barriers to entry in creating a startup). This is one of the reasons for endemic ‘duplication’ in the nonprofit sector. Then again, even such duplica-
tion can be healthy and warranted, the commercial sector also has duplication of course, but there we call it ‘competition’.

In general, when thinking about food hubs specifically, it can be more challenging for producers to be part of the former approach, and for charities to be part of the latter approach. Producers (in general) have more limited time and capacity to sit on committees, and have more urgency with respect to the seasonality of their production cycle. Producers in the YYC Food Hub case were eager to test the ordering process soon. Charities, on the other hand, are generally more familiar and comfortable with a longer planning cycle, and some in this pilot were restricted in their ability to participate fully (whether due to the expense of food products, the prior existence of other more familiar supplier relationships, or because at the Food Hub planning table were not in all cases the person ordering the food).

While charities in general can sometimes have less nimble operational cultures than private business, they are also dealing more frequently with vulnerable human beings. This means careful planning is more frequently the default modus of charitable organizations than the “move fast, fail forward” approach.

The YYC Food Hub undertook a combination of both approaches. On the planning and scanning side, a systems map was developed of key actors in the food system and how food gets to market (as well as how food is utilized or distributed specifically in the charitable sector). As well, many different advisors and stakeholders contributed to the planning and design of the model over many months. On the agile development side, multiple models were rapidly tested, one of which went to the full pilot phase, and then the Hub was able to pivot quickly away from the initial approach after only six weeks.

Community stakeholders referencing the YYC Food Hub noted this challenge of balancing planning with prototyping in a variety of different ways. Some were excited and eager to jump right in to try things out. Others felt that additional front-end research could have led to the design of a more resilient food hub pilot. Some wondered how different this project was from what has already been tried, or from another adjacent solution that already exists (for example, existing local food delivery models)? Could the pilot have been more resilient with a deeper understanding of other food hubs – what works, what doesn’t, and what might be different about the Calgary context? The quest for the right planning-prototyping balance yields other questions: might the equity investment to help scale YYC Growers, or to work more closely with the Alex Community Food Centre, both described elsewhere in this report, have been explored and tested before running the food hub pilot? Was a six-week pilot adequate to test the efficacy of the model? Would six months or a year have yielded any different results? Irrespective of these questions, the agile pivots described in this report could not have been possible with a conventional planning-centered approach, instead of slogging through a year-long pilot of the same model, the initiative is now able - mere weeks later - to explore, try and test new approaches.
Conditioning the Soil: Considering Further Pivots or Radical Re-adjustments

Beyond the key pivots described above, which are already underway, the YYC Food Hub initiative could consider the following additional pivots or re-adjustments over the coming year or beyond:

• **Expanding and diversifying upstream products and producers.** While it was acknowledged that the ‘early adopter’ producers willing to be part of the YYC Food Hub represent an excellent start, many of the downstream stakeholders expressed an interest in a broader array of products, as well as added choice and diversity of farmers, ranchers and other producers attached to the Food Hub.

• **Expanding and diversifying downstream food providers.** Many other food hubs have a wider diversity of downstream providers than was the case with the YYC Food Hub pilot, from market-based entities like small grocers and restaurants, to non-market providers like hospitals, schools and a wider array of nonprofit community groups. The initial (very small) group of ‘early adopter’ charities lacked sufficient interest, risk appetite and financial flexibility to ensure a successful pilot. It is hard to see how the Food Hub succeeds with only charities - even a much larger number of charities - as the downstream buyers/providers. A more sustainable pivot would reintroduce restaurants, small grocers, and institutional (a.k.a. ‘anchor’) buyers into the mix (e.g. schools, hospitals, post-secondary institutions, and other large nonprofit or public organizations), also taking advantage of the City’s newly approved Benefit Driven Procurement policy.

• **Value-added processing.** Downstream buyers/providers have commented that the nature of bulk volumes or packaging of some of the products makes it difficult to seamlessly integrate into their existing programs. For example, a bag of peeled and sliced carrots is not easily substituted with a bag of bulk unprocessed carrots, so there might be a role for the Food Hub as an intermediary to undertake value-added processing. This is actually the key driver for British Columbia’s newest food hubs: More income could be generated for small producers if they had affordable access to commercial kitchen, without having to build their own facilities. As more community partners become involved with the Hub, some of these organizations bring assets like commercial kitchens to the table.

• **Values-based purchasing.** The opportunity for agencies to think about social procurement policies and how they make purchasing decisions was an unexpected and hidden value of this pilot project. Moving forward, the buyers and project advisors in particular could benefit from exploring Values-Based Procurement, which can create a guiding framework for purchasing decisions. This would help build understanding of why each participant is moving away from just buying the least expensive produce and identify opportunities to source new members on the producer side (i.e. a purchaser may prefer local, but will accept a more distantly-sourced item if it is produced organically or using regenerative farming practices).

• **Local labelling.** There are a variety of local labelling initiatives that sometimes accompany local food or local purchasing initiatives. The Economic Nutrition Label, for example, is an initiative of Shorefast (a registered charity) and is fundamentally unsustainable at any significant scale. In theory, a large enough pool of donors/funds could help narrow the gap, but there are questions about the degree to which such a subsidy would meet the test of being ‘charitable’, and also whether this really would ultimately require some form of public investment akin to the federal Nutrition North program or supply management in the dairy sector to have the kind of scaled impact desired.

• **Seeding, or shifting to, a commercial or social enterprise.** A pivot toward a more commercially viable financial model will help make this initiative both more self-sustaining and scalable. YYC Growers, as a co-op, is one such structure. The Pay-What-You-Can market model might also have commercial viability. Another possibility would be to enter the food distribution game, competing directly with commercial distributors like Gordon’s or Wallace & Carey. Unlike many other Canadian cities, Calgary also lacks a downtown or near-downtown farmers’ market. Another commercial pivot would be toward a non-government version of a food terminal model.

• **Narrowing the price gap through philanthropy: One of the most vexing disconnects in increasing community access to healthy, sustainable, locally-produced food is the substantial price gap between the cost of such food and the cost of far cheaper food purchased through large retail chains (but which is also less healthy, sustainable or local). There are no easy answers for narrowing this price gap, but one solution could be to direct philanthropic dollars toward this. In the YYC Food Hub pilot, narrowing this price gap was one of the principal costs, but it is fundamentally unsustainable at any significant scale. In theory, a large enough pool of donors/funds could help narrow the gap, but there are questions about the degree to which such a subsidy would meet the test of being ‘charitable’, and also whether this really would ultimately require some form of public investment akin to the federal Nutrition North program or supply management in the dairy sector to have the kind of scaled impact desired.

• **Philanthropic convening:** The YYC Food Security Fund can use its networking and convening power to bring government, interested farmers, NGOs and other philanthropic and local food movement players together in a conversation about a more strategic approach to either upstream or downstream food security (or both). One model to consider advocating for is an Alberta “Greenbelt Foundation” model. The Greenbelt Foundation in Ontario helps steward and raise awareness about Ontario’s Greenbelt, two million acres of land protected as either farms or as natural ecosystems, protected from either industrial development or suburban sprawl, to help sustain a reliable local food and water supply to the “Golden Horseshoe” communities. The Foundation, the result of advocacy by a coalition of philanthropic foundations, local food groups, farmers and NGOs, is structured as a registered charity but receives the bulk of its funding from the provincial government.
Toward a Future Food-Secure Calgary

Shifting Policies, Practices, Mindsets

The path to ensuring a food-secure Calgary is multi-dimensional, but completely achievable. It requires further mobilization of evidence, commitment, and will from all levels of government, a much louder, more diverse, and more united voice from non-profits working on food security, and an appreciation and a commitment toward both downstream and upstream food security. It is important to note that this region is by no means unique in facing a daunting challenge to transform policies, practices, mindsets and systems:

"Across the world, food systems governance is marked by siloed and exclusionary processes that typically favour the participation, values, and interests of more powerful corporations, investors, big farmers, and large research institutes. The dominant position of larger agribusinesses and food corporations is such that these actors have acquired, in effect, a veto power in the political system, resulting in conflicting actions and a failure to address systemic drivers/bars.

The ideas and recommendations put forward here relate mainly to creating a supportive ecosystem for food hubs. This represents just a sample of the much larger array of steps - not outlined here - that will help us reconfigure our food system to end deprivation, maximize nutrition, strengthen sovereignty and build equity, innovation and sustainability into every aspect of food production, distribution and consumption.

Stakeholders contacted for this report emphasized that in order to achieve a food-secure Calgary, we, as a community, need to - at minimum - STOP doing the following things:

• STOP competing unnecessarily. While there is certainly a role for some heterogeneity of community organizations helping to alleviate food insecurity, the ‘sector’ is rife with rivalries, finger-pointing, and competing approaches and theories of change.
• STOP pretending that temporary measures to alleviate hunger or food access are in any way permanent solutions to downstream food insecurity. If organizations are not pursuing evidence-based policy change, collaborating with many other organizations, and incorporating a community-development ethos and public education practice into their work, it is difficult to claim to be addressing food insecurity.
• STOP assuming a new solution or organization is needed when we see a problem. Often individuals or groups try to start a new nonprofit because there are no barriers to entry. Stop, scan the landscape, identify gaps, and prioritize leveraging supports that already exist before creating something new.
• STOP restricting the flow of knowledge. Research should be funded and shared broadly, (especially with the government) and not be restricted behind paywalls or kept internal as institutional knowledge.
• STOP creating barriers for hungry people by collecting so much information from them. Reduce barriers and stigma by stepping away from the idea that we have to protect the system from people who are scamming it.
• STOP sitting in the office and get out on the land!
We also need to initiate and scale efforts around the following:

**Public Education**

The YYC Food Hub pivot described previously in the section Rotating the Crops: What’s Next outlines the need for additional public education, awareness and dialogue on food security. One possibility for a ‘quick win’ on enhancing public education around food security, is to invest in, help scale, and add to the learning programs of the Alex Community Food Centre. Longer term, there is an opportunity to challenge and work with post-secondary institutions to create interdisciplinary pathways, at undergraduate and graduate levels around food security. Four such programs for Alberta post-secondaries to draw inspiration from are St. Francis Xavier University’s Department of Human Nutrition’s collaboration with the Antigonish Farmers Market, George Brown College’s Honours Bachelor of Food Studies program, Ryerson University’s Centre for Food Security, which offers certificates in food security and urban agriculture and the Laurier Centre for Sustainable Food Systems at Wilfrid Laurier University, which runs a community-embedded research program and hosts the UNESCO Chair on Food, Biodiversity, and Sustainability Studies.

**Policies to Eliminate Downstream Food Insecurity**

The Right to Food: Like most countries, there is currently no constitutionally enshrined right to food security in Canada. However, Canadians already have a right to health care, enshrined through the Canada Health Act, and there is a strong and growing affirmation of a rights-based approach to housing: The 2019 National Housing Strategy Act “recognize[s] that the right to adequate housing is a fundamental human right affirmed in international law”, noting that such a right is enshrined in Chapter 11 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Chapter 12 of that same UN covenant asserts the right to food, noting that “the right to adequate food is realized when every man, woman and child, alone or in community with others, has physical and economic access at all times to adequate food or means for its procurement.”

**Adequate Income Support:** As pointed out in previous sections of this document, for the vast majority of the population food insecurity is a symptom of inadequate income levels. Income supplements, alongside parallel supports to alleviate poverty, will all help address downstream food insecurity. As such, overhauling and greatly enhancing investment in federal and provincial income supports can be expected to have a demonstrable, and at a sufficient scale, transformative effect on food security. A universal basic income (UBI) is one such innovation advocated by many across the political spectrum. There are many variations on UBI, including versions that are not universal or that look more like a reverse income tax. While early experiments around the world on basic income schemes are promising, including the now-famous Dauphin Manitoba pilot many decades ago, many of these permutations require additional testing and piloting at scale in order to build the evidence and mainstream the concept sufficient for both policy innovation and political will to follow. Living wage initiatives, and minimum wage legislation that ensures a living wage, are also helpful steps.

**Policies to Enhance Upstream Food Security**

*Federal actions:* Agricultural policy in Canada is broken on many fronts: It is overwhelmingly export-driven, biasing large, often multi-national producers, distributors and value-added processors, while promoting or incentivizing ecologically harmful methods and practices that exploit human labour and/or animals beyond what would be considered humane. Canada needs to shift to a more humane, responsible and regenerative food production framework, guided, for example, by the Principles of Responsible Investment in Agriculture and Food Systems advanced by the Committee on World Food Security.

Food production and distribution has always been heavily subsidized, in Canada and elsewhere, so it is more a question of reconfiguring existing subsidies than imposing new burdens on the tax system. Agroecology, agroforestry, small farms and Indigenous food production, for example, should be beneficiaries of such a shift, as should efforts to promote food traceability and true cost accounting.

**Provincial actions:** There are many concrete steps that can be taken provincially. The actions taken in Alberta to create an ecosystem supportive of craft brewers was catalytic in creating one of the most exciting local beer scenes in North America over the last half-decade. The Alberta Government should follow in the footsteps of the B.C. government by helping seed and support a provincwide network of regional food hubs. This should be preceded by a careful food systems mapping and grassroots listening process, to optimize locations, collaborators and models. The province regulates co-ops already, but it would be optimal to support the growth and capacity of food co-ops working in every part of the supply and value chain. The province also must ensure that farmers and farm workers have adequate incomes, and safe working and healthy living conditions.

**Municipal actions:** An enhanced municipal interest and presence in the food conversation is critical to supporting a thriving local food scene. The Calgary Eats strategy is now nearly a decade old, and the City of Calgary has only one publicly identifiable full-time staff resource dedicated to food security issues in the city. There was an additional temporary mobilization of additional resources, notably a community social worker who helped support communication and coordination between the many grassroots nonprofits working on emergency food. The City’s existing support to civil society groups should be enhanced vis-à-vis promoting collaboration and collective impact, as well as shared knowledge and capacity building. However, partly because Calgary has never had a social planning council (in contrast to Edmonton), there is no city-wide food council or municipal-scale advisory or coordinating body. Such committees run the risk of being an ineffectual layer of bureaucracy, but on the other hand they signal municipal interest and commitment to the issue.

**Civil Society Voice on Food Security**

Almost universally, civil society organizations express the need to enhance public policy around food security. Yet, there are strikingly few visible signs of nonprofit organizations ‘putting their money where their mouth is’: Few local organizations engage in any significant public policy work, and few of those who do describe this work in their public communications. While it is possible that this might be the remnants of the ‘advocacy chill’ that registered charities experienced over the past few decades, most of the regulatory barriers no longer exist. Even at a national level, the picture is uneven.
Appendix A

Glossary of Common Food Security Terms

100-Mile Diet - Based on a namesake Canadian best-seller book published in 2007 by Alisa Smith and J.B. MacKinnon, the 100-Mile Diet challenges people to restrict their diet to foods grown within 100 miles of their residence. Implicit in this is exclusive reliance on local producers (directly, or through farmer’s markets or local food hubs).

15 Minute City - The 15-Minute City Project, popularized by Paris Mayor Anne Hidalgo, advocates for urban development and reconfiguration such that all city dwellers have access to essential urban services, including access to food, within a 15 minute walk or bike. An outgrowth of Jane Jacobs’ writings and of urban planning concepts like smart growth, walkable communities, age-friendly cities and active cities, the 15-minute city concept, elusive in most parts of urban Canada (even in the adapted “20-minute neighbourhood” form), is the antithesis of a food desert.

Community Food Centre - The Community Food Centre model is a Canadian innovation, developed originally at The Stop Community Food Centre in Toronto. Over the past decade, the model has been replicated in 11 Canadian communities. The concept provides gathering space in a low-income neighbourhood, focused on building food literacy, cooking and gardening skills, as well as purchasing (in part) directly from local producers.

Community Kitchen (a.k.a. Collective Kitchen) - A community kitchen is a group of people who meet to prepare meals to assist in times of community emergencies.

Food desert - Food deserts are pockets of communities where residents have limited or no access to affordable food retail. The term was originally introduced in the 1990s in Western Canada to describe poor access to nutritious food experienced by publicly housed residents, but in many Canadian cities low urban densities, poor planning, food distribution systems, and retail economies conspire to concentrate affordable food in locations that are often well away from where people live, particularly people who are reliant on transit and walking.

Food Hamper Program - Food hampers came out of the Victorian British tradition of gifting baskets filled with food, typically during the Christmas holidays. The tradition, which began as neighbours gifting to neighbours, took two paths as industrial capitalism advanced - one a luxury path (the modern day “gift basket”), the other in the form of charitable food boxes. Food hamper programs in Canada are run not just by food banks, but by religious organizations, neighbourhood associations, or other community groups. Conservatively, there are at least 3,000 such programs nationwide.

Food Hub (a.k.a. Food Distribution Hub) - Food hubs are a way to bridge upstream and downstream food security, supporting the regional agricultural value chain through relationships with local farmers and other producers, while at the same time supporting local access, small retailers and affordable consumption. A generic term with no precise definition, there are many kinds of food hubs, from large-scale commercial food distribution centres to grassroots community food centres. As noted in the Food Hub Business Assessment Toolkit, “the term ‘food hub’ emerged in the last decade to more commonly describe alternative food aggregation, distribution, and processing enterprises that began developing or expanding within regions across the country; these enterprises sought to fill gaps in infrastructure to link food from farms to consumers within the same region.”

Food Insecurity - The inverse of food security, can be defined as the inability to acquire or consume an adequate diet or sufficient quantity of food in socially acceptable ways, or the uncertainty that one will be able to do so and/or as “the inadequate or insecure access to food due to financial constraints.”

Food Sovereignty - “Food Sovereignty is the right of peoples to healthy and culturally appropriate food produced through ecologically sound and sustainable methods, and their right to define their own food and agriculture systems.” This definition is proffered by La Via Campesina, a global movement of farmers advocating for sustainable family-based agriculture, though food sovereignty can refer to a non-agricultural-based society, and can apply at multiple scales, from an indigenous nation to a nation-state.

Food System - As the UN Food Systems Summit Notes, “the term “food system” refers to the constellation of activities involved in producing, processing, transporting and consuming food.”

Foodsheds - A foodshed plays on the idea of a watershed, a geographic region defined by a drainage basin, but instead of water refers to “food flows” - i.e. the flow of food from where it is produced to the place where it is consumed. As such, a foodshed encompasses where a given community’s food is harvested, the route it travels (including the markets it passes through), and the households where it is ultimately consumed. The concept of a foodshed, viewed through an idealized sustainability lens, is analogous to the “100 mile diet” concept. In reality, a given city’s foodshed is of course far larger, even global in many respects (foodsheds being mainly a cognitive mapping device to think about food origins, traceability, carbon footprint, and so on).
Local Food Movement - Local food movements, which can take many forms, from decentralized movements, to grassroots campaigns, to food labelling or policy advocacy initiatives, aim to better connect food producers (farmers, fishers, etc.) with consumers in the same geographic region. Local food movements, often allied with the community economic development and/or sustainability movement, seek to support local economies and develop a more self-reliant and resilient food system. While local food movements have existed since at least the 1930s, they have experienced a resurgence over the past decade. Recent examples in Canada—many short-lived—include labeling initiatives such as Localize, Local Flavour Plus, and Shorefast Foundation’s Economic Nutrition Labelling, as well as the Slow Food, Farm-to-Table, and 100 Mile Diet movements. Terra Madre is an example of an international local food movement.

Locavorism - An individual who is passionate about sourcing their food locally, and is often an active member or supporter of a local food movement.

Organic Farming - Organic farming, sometimes conflated with the broader category or sustainable farming, is a certification-based system that prohibits synthetic pesticides, antibiotics, synthetic fertilizers, genetically modified organisms, and growth hormones. Organic farming also typically promotes genetic and biological diversity. Last year, Canadians spent nearly $7 billion on organic food (3.2% of the total food market share), and while most organic food is imported, there are over 5,600 certified organic producers in Canada. 191

Pay-What-You-Can (or Pay-What-You-Want) Retail - Pay-what-you-can grocery stores, which can be either mobile, stand-alone or part of food hubs, are a relatively new concept, intended to address at least two critiques of food hamper approaches by providing consumer choice and—in theory—reducing stigma. Toronto’s Feed It Forward store, opened in 2018 as the first pay-what-you-can store globally, “sells” food and ingredients that are donated by larger grocery supply chains who aren’t allowed to sell the products, in part because the produce is deemed too “ugly” to sell in a normal retail environment. 192 In a pay-what-you-want approach, anonymity at the point of sale is important (i.e. to remove the stigma potentially associated with other customers seeing what another customer is paying).

Pop-Up Food Market (a.k.a. Mobile Food Markets) - Pop-up or mobile food markets are temporary retail locations typically specializing in fresh (and often locally sourced) produce, strategically located (in food deserts, near seniors centres or transit stations, for example) to help address public access to fresh, healthy food.

Slow Food - Slow Food is a global, grassroots movement, founded in 1989, “to prevent the disappearance of local food cultures and traditions, counteract the rise of fast life and combat people’s dwindling interest in the food they eat, where it comes from and how our food choices affect the world around us.” Like “slow fashion”, minimalism, and the circular economy, it is a philosophy that pushes against the global dominance of rapid, throwaway, conspicuous consumption.

Sustainable Agriculture - There is no precise definition of sustainable agriculture, but it broadly refers to management practices that promote soil and water conservation, low carbon energy use, humane treatment of animals, and typically also promotes genetic and biological diversity (such as through heirloom varieties, open-air pollination, seed saving, and ecosystem protection or restoration), the latter variant often referred to as “regenerative agriculture” or “permaculture.” Organic farming is a specific type of sustainable agriculture.

Urban Agriculture - Urban agriculture refers to cultivation within urban boundaries, whether for personal or household consumption, community sharing or commercial distribution. It can take many forms, from simple gardening to indoor aquaculture or vertical hydroponic farming, to municipal orchards, urban beekeeping, or experimental urban farms. Similarly, urban farming can be for leisure or hobby purposes primarily, or more land- and labour-intensive operations designed expressly to address food insecurity, such as with Cuba’s organopónicos.

Universal Basic Income - Universal basic income (UBI) is a proposed tax redistribution program in which every (adult) citizen receives a set amount of income monthly or annually. UBI has proponents on the left, as a basic income system could substantially eliminate poverty and at minimum address food insecurity. But it also has many proponents on the right, who argue it is more efficient (and less paternalistic) than the many needs-based social programs it would, in theory, replace.
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Methodology

One round of video-conference-based conversations were conducted in June/July 2021 with key stakeholders involved in aspects of the YYC Local Food Distribution Hub, as well as other members of the food security ecosystem in Calgary. A list of these conversations is included in the next Appendix. These conversations effectively served as a point-in-time check-in.

We have also consulted both academic and non-academic literature on the topic of food security, with particular regard to models and recommended practices for food hubs. Works cited include not only scholarly insights on food security and food systems, but also media stories, policy papers produced by think tanks, foundations, governments or UN agencies, and insights into case studies and best practices.

Please note that this work does not constitute academic research, nor will it lead to an academic paper or presentation at an academic seminar or conference. Rather, this is instead considered the equivalent of a “program review”, which is specifically exempted from the requirement of approval from the MRU Human Research Ethics Board. Nonetheless, as the Institute is conducting this work under the auspices of MRU, and in the furtherance of sound inquiry involving human respondents, the key principles articulated by the Human Research Ethics Board have been adhered to.

It should also be noted that, to the best of our knowledge, our community stakeholders were not themselves food insecure, which is a limitation of a program review. For insights into the first-hand experience of food- insecure Calgarians, refer to the Calgary Emergency Food Report produced by Vibrant Communities Calgary in partnership with the Canadian Poverty Institute.
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Stakeholder Conversations

Producers
- Tony Marshall, President and Co-Founder, Highwood Crossing Foods
- Rod Olson, Regenerative Agriculture Expert and Community Inspiration, YYC Growers
- Heather Broughton, Owner and Business Manager, SWG Farms; Principal, Agri-Food Management Excellence Inc.
- Colleen Biggs, Owner, TK Ranch
- Laurel Winters, Farm Manager, Winter’s Turkeys

Nonprofits
- Audra Stevenson, Interim CEO, Leftovers Foundation
- Janice Curtis, Executive Director, Calgary Meals on Wheels
- Karen Forster, Production Manager, Calgary Meals on Wheels
- Darrell Howard, Team Lead, The Alex

Facilitators
- Zai Mamdani, Food Security YYC
- Gena Rotstein, Place2Give

External Ecosystem
- Karen Anderson, Founder & President, Alberta Food Tours, Inc.
- Julie Black, Citizen Engagement Associate, Calgary Foundation
- Nancy Dick, Community Social Worker - Spruce Cliff, Calgary Neighbourhoods, City of Calgary
- Alice Lam, Founder, Good Neighbour Community Market
- Fiona Mattatall, Assistant Professor, General Obstetrician and Gynecologist; Assistant Professor, University of Calgary
- James McAra, President, Calgary Food Bank
- Lynn McIntyre, PROOF Investigator; Professor Emerita of Community Health Sciences, Cumming School of Medicine, University of Calgary
- Heather Nelson de Rojas, Senior Lecturer, Mount Royal University
- Kristi Peters, Sustainability Consultant, City Wide Policy, Calgary Growth Strategies, City of Calgary
- Ingrid Waslyshen, Grants Associate, Calgary Foundation
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Recommended Resources

Other Food Hubs

Canadian: Established Food Hubs
- 100KM Foods (Toronto) “wholesale local food distributor in Toronto that connects local farmers with urban markets.”
- Cape Breton Food Hub (Cape Breton) provides “infrastructure and distribution to over 50 food producers with households and restaurants across the island.”
- Fireweed Food Hub (Winnipeg) is “an aggregator and wholesale distributor of locally and regionally produced vegetables, meats, honey, grains, and other food products.” Structured as a cooperative with food sold on consignment, the Fireweed Food Hub aims to connect local procedures with more sustainable practices with community grocers, restaurants, hospitals, schools and other community groups who might otherwise struggle to access local food. The co-op also runs a Farmers’ Market.
- Food4Good (formerly West End Food Hub Alliance) (Edmonton) formed as a network of community organizations and churches in west inner-city Edmonton. Working in alliance with Community Food Centres Canada, they aim to provide community learning about cooking, gardening and sustainable urban agriculture.
- The Dock+ (Port Alberni) is a shared 17,000 sq ft. space, with a commercial kitchen, owned by the Port Alberni Port Authority at Fishermen’s Harbour. It provides start-ups and small businesses an environment not just for value-added processing, but also as a coworking environment for growth, development, and collaboration.
- The Station Food Hub (Newport Station) works to empower “the community of aspiring food entrepreneurs, providing them with the necessary resources needed to build and sustain successful food businesses Emerging Food Hubs - some have limited information online
- The City of Yellowknife completed a Food Hub Feasibility Study and were working on next steps as of June 2021
- The Yukon Government committed to funding and support for local food hub development in Local Food Strategy for Yukon: Encouraging the Production and Consumption of Yukon-Grown Food 2016-2021

Beyond Canada

- The Common Market (United States) is a nonprofit regional food distributor connecting anchor institutions (e.g., schools, universities, hospitals, correctional facilities) with sustainable family farms. The net revenue generated from sales enables “food access partnerships”, subsidizing charities and other downstream community food groups to purchase food at cost, while farmers are paid fairly at market price.
- Local Food Directories: Food Hub Directory (United States) contains over 200 food hubs in the USA
- Alaska Food Hub
- Bring It Food Hub (Memphis)
- Puget Sound Food Hub (Washington State)
- EIT Food Hubs (Europe) - regional ‘contact points’ in Regional Innovation Scheme (EIT) Regional Innovation Scheme (RIS) countries. “These organisations are key players in their national innovation eco-systems and gather strong regional outreach and experience in supporting entrepreneurs and organising local events.”
Calgary Emergency Food Resources

- CalgaryEATS! is Calgary's busiest and best known emergency food source.
- Calgary Food Bank is Calgary's busiest and best known emergency food source.
- Calgary 211, run by the Distress Centre, connects those in need of food and other emergency support to community resources and services. Reach out via phone, text or online chat.
- The Alex Community Food Centre is a community gathering place located on International Avenue in Edmonton, partnering with over 85 Alberta businesses and supporting regenerative farms and farmers throughout the province.
- Good Neighbour provides affordable meals to seniors, helping them age in place.
- Food Secure Canada supports students across the country to create healthy, just, and sustainable food systems. It produces a variety of reports and tools pertaining to food security among students.
- A community-led and interdisciplinary team investigating household food insecurity in Canada.

Other Local Food Resources

- Alberta Food Matters was founded by a group of dietitians and nutritionists as a network to connect and support asset-based efforts to promote food sovereignty and food security in Alberta, and to understand the real value of real food and regenerative agriculture.
- Alberta Food Tours leads local and regional food tour experiences in Calgary, Banff, Canmore and Edmonton, partnering with over 85 Alberta businesses and supporting regenerative farms and farmers throughout the province.
- The Alex Community Food Centre is a community gathering place located on International Avenue in Edmonton, partnering with over 85 Alberta businesses and supporting regenerative farms and farmers throughout the province.
- The Edmonton Food Council is an award-winning nonprofit social enterprise operating mobile (pop-up) grocery stores and urban agriculture, and takes an active role in supporting the implementation of fresh, healthy, and affordable food into neighborhoods facing barriers to accessing fresh, healthy, affordable produce and other food.
- Impact Hub Praha (Croatia) - connected to 14 cities which provide ‘organisational and operational frameworks [to] join together local smallholder farmers, food processors, authorities, researchers and NGOs.
- Akaki, Nifas Silk Food Hub (Addis Ababa, Ethiopia)
- Kiitu Food Hub (Kenya)
- Impact Hub Praha (Croatia)

Food Policy Resources

- Coalition for Healthy School Food is a 170-member organization advocating for public funding, federal standards, and universal cost-sharing to ensure that every child in Canada has a healthy meal or snack at school.
- Committee on World Food Security is an international and intergovernmental platform on food security policy and research, operating as a partnership between the UN Food & Agricultural Organization (FAO), World Food Programme (WFP) and the High-Level Panel of Experts on Food Security and Nutrition (HLPE). It produces voluntary guidelines and best practice summaries on such topics as the right to food, agro-ecology and responsible agriculture.
- Food Banks Canada supports a network of Provincial Associations, affiliate food banks, and food agencies that work at the community level to relieve hunger. They undertake research and policy work relating to food insecurity and poverty alleviation.
- FoodShare is a Toronto-based nonprofit organization with a wide-ranging suite of programs, from community kitchens to school nutrition programs to a mobile food market. FoodShare also promotes “food justice” focusing in particular on the intersection of racism and food insecurity.
- Food Secure Canada is a pan-Canadian alliance of organizations and individuals working together to advance food security and food sovereignty.
- Global Alliance for the Future of Food is a strategic worldwide alliance of philanthropic foundations, supported by a secretariat based in Canada, collaborating on action across the planet to transform food systems and their impact on climate change and food security.
- Maple Leaf Centre for Action on Food Security, named after its principal supporter Maple Leaf Foods, supports capacity building and public policy work toward a sustainable food secure Canada.
- Meal Exchange supports students across the country to create healthy, just, and sustainable food systems. It produces a variety of reports and tools pertaining to food security among students.
- PROOF is an interdisciplinary research team investigating household food insecurity in Canada. It involves researchers from the University of Toronto, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, the University of Calgary, Memorial University, and the Centre for Addiction and Mental Health (CAMH).
- UN Food Systems Summit brings together key players from the worlds of science, business, policy, healthcare and academia, as well as farmers, indigenous people, youth organizations, consumer groups, environmental activists, and other key stakeholders. Convened in 2021 as part of the decade of Action to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) by 2030.
- World Food Systems Centre (WFSC), based out of ETH Zürich, is a public research university consistently ranked as one of the best in the world.

Important Canadian Books, Reports and Publications

- Civil Society and Social Movements in Food System Governance is an analysis of the effect of social movements on food systems based on an international representative set of case studies.
- Edible Histories, Cultural Politics: Towards a Canadian Food History investigates the history of food including Culinary Colonialism, food and faith, and the politics of food in Canada.
- Examining Calgary’s Emergency Food Assistance System provides a deep dive into Calgary’s Emergency Food System and recommendations to improve the system’s capacity.
- Poverty in Calgary Municipal Ward Profiles includes a variety of poverty-related data, including food security, organized by ward in Calgary.
- Take Back the Tray chronicles Joshua Maharaj’s experiences working with institutions to rethink the way they procure, cook, and serve food.

Young Agrarians (YA) is a farmer to farmer educational resource network for new and young farmers in Canada. YA’s work, which promotes agriculture as a viable career for young people and diverse Canadians, supports ecological, organic and regenerative farmers, as well as urban growers, and is guided by such principles as agro-ecology, collaboration, food sovereignty, reconciliation, and building equity into land access. In Alberta, YA hosts learning events, apprenticeship programs and provides online and in-person farmer-to-farmer tools and training.
See, for example, Daschuk, J. (2018). Clearing the Plains: Disease, Politics of Starvation, and the Loss of Indigenous Life. University of Regina Press. Daschuk recounts, as an example, a report by the Department of Indian Affairs in 1879 describing horrific scenes of mass human famine and starvation at Fort Battleford. MacDonald boasted in parliament of how his government was “...being rigid, even stingy, in the distribution of food and [how they] require absolute proof of starvation before distributing it,” and how First Nations were taken off food rations as punishment for being “trouble makers.”

See, for example, Braden Eternzer’s award-winning student systems analysis of Food Access in Indigenous Communities in Northern British Columbia, submitted in 2017 to the Map the System competition, hosted by the Skoll Centre for Social Entrepreneurship at Oxford University; www.mapthesystem.ca/2017
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The nonprofits in the pilot phase were Calgary Meals on Wheels, YMCA, Leftovers/Fresh Routes, Trellis, The Alex, the Calgary Food Bank, Ogden Youth Centre, and the Calgary Stampede.
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See, for example, Jovana Maharaj’s stories about producer flexibility when procuring oatmeal and apples, Maharaj, J. (2020). Take Back the Tray. p. 91-92.
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See, for example, an in depth summary of literature on the potential and perceived efficacy of Alternative Food Networks and other food movements in Andrée, P., Clark, J. K., Levkoe, C. Z., Lowitt, K., & Johnston, C. (2019). The Governance Engagement Continuum: Food Movement Mobilization and the Execution of Power Through Governance Arrangements. In Andrée, Clark, Levkoe, & Lowitt, (Eds.). Civil Society and Social Movements in Food System Governance (pp. 19-43).
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For example, “Philanthropists and social investors recognize that systems change is necessary to address a range of social problems. Initiatives aimed at individuals and implemented in a piecemeal fashion have repeatedly come up short. By seeking to address specific problems—or even particular aspects of specific problems—at the level of the individual, these initiatives ignore the underlying drivers responsible for the problems” in Kaplan, S. D. (2021). Building relationships. Strengthening Neighbors. Stanford Social Innovation Review. https://ssir.org/articles/entry/building_relationships_strengthening_neighbors?utm_source=News&utm_medium=Email&utm_campaign=SSIR_Now.
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Among Community Stakeholders, there were some suggestions that there were not actual shortages of some items, it just looked that way. Food items were still available, but factors like packaging regulations and the delay in shifting food destined to restaurants over to grocery stores gave the appearance of a shortage. However, the nuance was likely not discernible to the consumer seeing empty shelves at the grocery store.
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