FOOD TRAILS

Deliverable 1.3
Report food-based urban participatory policies

Grant agreement number	Project acronym	Project Title
101000812	FOOD TRAILS	Building pathways towards FOOD 2030-led urban food policies

Deliverable details

Title	WP	Version
D1.3 Food-based urban participatory policies	WP1 - MAPPING	1.0

Contractual delivery date	Actual delivery date	Dissemination level
15/07/2021 (M9)	15/07/2021 (M9)	PU

Lead partner	Contributing partner(s)	Reviewers
SF	EUR, RUC	FPM, BM

History of changes

Version	Date	Comments	Main Authors
0.1	12/04/2021	Creation of document structure	SF, RUC
0.2	30/06/2021	First document draft	SF
0.3	06/07/2021	Integration of partners contribution	RUC
0.4	07/07/2021	Integration of partners contribution	SF, RUC
0.5	08/07/2021	Document revision, minor corrections and quality review	FPM, BM, CU
0.6	14/07/2021	Second document draft	SF, RUC
1.0	15/07/2021	Release of final version	

Disclaimer

This document contains confidential information in the form of the **FOOD TRAILS** project findings, work and products and its use is strictly regulated by the **FOOD TRAILS** Consortium Agreement and by Contract no. 101000812.

Neither the **FOOD TRAILS** Consortium nor any of its officers, employees or agents shall be responsible, liable in negligence, or otherwise howsoever in respect of any inaccuracy or omission herein.

The contents of this document are the sole responsibility of the **FOOD TRAILS** consortium and can in no way be taken to reflect the views of the European Commission and the REA.

Table of contents

Executive summary

The present document represents D1.3, **Report on food-based urban participatory policies.** The Report includes and illustrates the results of a **qualitative analysis** on food-based urban participatory processes at the European level. By carrying out a series of interviews and disseminating an online survey, partners collaborating on this task collected information on instances in which citizens were involved in the design and implementation of urban food policies.

The aim of this report is to inform partner cities on key elements to take into account to foster and facilitate citizens participation in the development and implementation of food initiatives and policies, and its results will serve to inform the setting up of Food Trail's pilots and living labs.

While some of the survey respondents were from FOOD TRAILS partner cities, the interviewees represented municipalities or organisations which are not members of the FOOD TRAILS Consortium, so as to garner external **information and knowledge developed in experiences falling outside the Consortium's remit**.

Aside from **structured policies**, the research process also took into consideration different types of **food-related participatory initiatives and projects**. Although these tend to be less complex and comprehensive, they revealed relevant learnings on the involvement of different stakeholders in inclusive policy design. Indeed, the variety of actors engaged in policy design and implementation in different case studies is one of the main observations we were able to make in carrying out the analysis. **Local authorities, CSOs, NGOs and the private sector can interact in a wide variety of different ways and their interaction can follow various patterns according to the specific setup of the collaboration.** This is particularly relevant when considering the structure that food-based participatory policy making processes are given, i. e. whether they are initiated from the citizenry ("**bottom-up**" processes) or from the municipality ("**top-down**" processes).

The topics and issues addressed by initiatives also vary greatly, an aspect which, among other things, reveals how different process, carried out by different actors in different geographical and social contexts, can revolve around different priorities. At the same time, it is interesting to note how strong similarities emerged to link the various experiences, allowing for some overarching considerations to be made.

Namely, while the approaches to building **participatory approaches to the development of food-based urban policies** vary considerably in their more technical and operational details, **Food Policy Councils do seem to be emerging as the most prominent medium for their implementation**.

After referring to the theoretical and methodological canvas that underlined the research in the Introduction, the Report presents brief summaries of the case studies

based on the qualitative interviews that were carried out, highlighting relevant aspects and learnings that emerged from them. The most prominent themes and commonalities that transpired from the different interviews and survey responses are summarised in four thematic paragraphs in Chapter Three, followed by the Conclusions, in which some key recommendations have been identified in order to concretely support the development of food-based urban participatory policy making in other instances.

1. Introduction

The present document illustrates the results of the analysis conducted within WP1 – T1.3 on the participatory initiatives that involve citizens engaged in the design and implementation of food policies and initiatives.

In recent decades, the **agri-food system** has undergone a significant transformation, integrating concerns about **societal challenges**, such as food inequality, food democracy and food sovereignty, environmental impact of food production and public health impacts of unhealthy diets.

Lang et al. (2009) argue that relevant institutions must be developed to undertake the role of advocating for the above-mentioned concerns. As cities and **municipalities within welfare societies are responsible for public wellbeing**, providing clean drinking water, clean air, guarantee access to healthy food for all, they are becoming increasingly aware of the need to fulfil these responsibilities and of the possibilities related to their role in the **development of a sustainable and healthy future for their citizens.**

The concept of food democracy has gained growing attention based on an argumentation that the increased influence of large corporations on the food system should be counterbalanced by influence 'from below' (Baldy & Kruse, 2019; Hassanein, 2003; Lang, 1999). Though food has not traditionally been considered the responsibility of municipalities and local authorities more generally, in recent years the **focus on the development of urban food policies as a tool to solve some of the environmental, social and economic challenges related to the current agri-food systems** has strengthened.

The **rising interest in citizen participation is** not limited to its relevance for the general implementation of food democracy, as it is also key in the development of urban food policies. The aim of a strong involvement of citizens in urban food policy development is that of overcoming some of the power and influence **imbalances that characterise the agri-food system** and to work with the tensions inherent to defining what a sustainable agri-food system is (Hassanein, 2003). This points towards new methods for collaboration between civil society, state actors and economic actors with new governance mechanisms (Baldy & Kruse, 2019; Van de Griend, Duncan & Wiskerke, 2019).

Participation can be driven by public authorities or by non-governmental actors (or a mix of the two) and actors can have different roles in relation to initiating, shaping, and implementing participatory processes (Baldy & Kruse, 2019). Participation can also differ in its aims, scope, and methodologies. In recent years

there has been an **increased focus on approaches such as Food Policy Councils**, citizens' juries (Henderson et al., 2013), and food citizenship (Wilkins, 2005).

Studies have shown that apart from gaining influence on the development and/or implementation of specific projects or policies, participation processes driven by public authorities can also lead to increased knowledge and reflection about respective agendas (Baldy and Kruse, 2019; Henderson et al., 2013). However, urban food policy is still in its emerging phases in most cities and the development and implementation of food policies and food initiatives is often fragmented in *ad hoc* work with no clear definition of responsibilities, therefore lacking an 'institutional home' (Hawkes & Halliday, 2017).

Looking into the literature about initiatives driven by public authorities, Van de Griend, Duncan & Wiskerke (2019) have examined how civil servants frame the participation of Non-Governmental Actors in participatory urban food policy development. They identify two different frames: **the *reactive frame***, based on the understanding that **initiatives should stem from society itself**, and the *responsibility frame*, in which it is considered the responsibility of the **municipality to initiate and facilitate participation from society** in general. In practice '*they often find themselves operating between [the] two competing frames*' (p. 62). In the responsibility frame it can be difficult to ensure participation beyond the municipal agenda, with the risk that participation becomes a legitimisation exercise. However, sensing that the municipality takes responsibility and engages actively can also be a source of motivation for many NGAs, increasing awareness and willingness to participate among citizens. In a similar vein, Baldy and Kruse found that when local authorities take on a leading role in initiating a process, it can '*motivate and justify food-related transformation with an orientation towards community good and create legitimacy of the Process.*' (2019, p. 73).

Fung (2015) points to some **challenges** that cut across participatory governance broadly and which are also relevant for the domain of food policy. **Participatory processes often lack systematic leadership**, thus many initiatives arise '*from the coincidental alignment of forces.*' (Fung, 2015, p. 520), with short-term engagement. Secondly, there is **no consensus on the scope of direct participation and its role in a democratic society**, with the consequence that each initiative '*must develop freestanding explanations and justifications anew— explaining to allies, supporters, and opponents alike why increased public engagement might be desirable in itself, might have good consequences, and what it could look like.*' (p. 521). The third major challenge is what Fung calls '*the limited scope and powers of participatory innovations.*' (Fung, 2015: 513). The main consequence of this limitedness is that outcomes of participatory processes are too often trivial, and don't engender meaningful change. Such challenges have also been pointed out in relation to food policy initiatives and are exemplary of why it is

central for participation to be meaningful and not only symbolic (Griend Duncan & Wiskerke, 2019; Henderson et al., 2013). Another central challenge is **how to reach citizens beyond 'the usual suspects'** (Van de Griend Duncan & Wiskerke, 2019).

However, the nuances and complexities of citizen participation have not yet been fully explored. Particularly, there is a gap in research on initiatives driven by public authorities, as well as on the internal processes, the relationships and the mechanisms that come into play between cities and citizens (Baldy & Kruse, 2019; Van de Griend Duncan & Wiskerke, 2019; Hawkes & Halliday, 2017).

The case studies that follow in this report provide examples of processes driven by local authorities as well as initiatives driven by non-governmental actors. The cases might serve as inspiration for how some of the opportunities and challenges identified in the literature can be implemented or overcome in practice, as well as providing more insights into some of the difficulties that remain and should be further explored in future development of participatory food policy initiatives. The thematic clusters in Chapter Three and the Recommendations that close this Report represent a *summa* of the lessons we derived from our analysis of the case studies.

Methodology

The report is based on empirical data collected through two different methodologies: interviews and a structured survey.

Nine interviews were conducted – five with actors from municipalities around Europe and four with representatives of NGOs/CSOs – each showcasing different approaches, successes and difficulties in designing and implementing participatory processes in municipal/regional policy development. The cases are chosen to provide **experiences both from within the city administration, and from NGO/CSO perspectives on working in a participatory manner in urban contexts**. Most cases focus on food policy, however, three cases refer to participatory policy processes more generally, since there are several potential learnings to be gleaned on participatory methodologies that are not topic-specific. None of the municipalities or organisations whose representatives were interviewed are partners in the FOOD TRAILS Consortium, as the aim was to integrate the knowledge available within it with other experiences and information.

The interviews were conducted online by the Food Trails teams at Slow Food and Roskilde University. Most interviews were held in English, however three were carried out in Italian and one in Danish. The interviews were video-recorded, transcribed and translated into English when necessary. The interviews were analysed

individually and summarised into nine case studies (Chapter Two), as well as cross-analysed (Chapter Three) with the purpose of identifying common successes and challenges. Furthermore, the cross-analysis also attended to context-specificities by considering the differences between cases.

The questionnaire-based survey was carried out April through May 2021 in English, Italian and French, receiving 48 responses overall. The aim of the survey was to gain information on relevant initiatives throughout Europe and to explore the current status of working with participatory processes in the development of policy in general and food policies more specifically, as well as in the development of individual local projects. They were compiled by municipal employees from ten different cities, six of which are partners in the Food Trails project, and twenty-one organisations (some cities replied referring to multiple different projects and initiatives). As well as providing an overview, the survey was used to supplement the case studies, e.g. by determining whether evidence from these also transpired from other contexts.

2. Case studies

Cities

In this section, we will be looking at case studies relating to food-based participatory policy making initiatives that have been developing in five European cities (Aarhus, Barcelona, Ghent, Glasgow and Wroclaw). These cities differ significantly in terms of size, geographical location, socio-economic characteristics and overall food environments, as well as having dissimilar histories and cultures in terms of citizen participation in policy building.

Accordingly, the policies and initiatives that have been put into practice in each city present peculiar features and dynamics, which we have attempted to emphasise in the following paragraphs. Clarifying how **different backgrounds and political contexts tend to produce specific policy outcomes can support more informed approaches to the development of participatory urban policy making processes**.

a) Aarhus

Food Maker initiative and co-creation

Aarhus is the second largest city in Denmark, (300,000 inhabitants). In this case study we focus on the municipal initiative 'Food Maker' and its co-creation processes. Food Maker was funded externally and anchored in the Municipality's department of Public Health. The purpose of the project was to **promote young people's health and well-being through communities, relations, and food enjoyment**.

The project lasted for two project periods of three years each (2015-2018 and 2018-2021). The first period focussed on **co-creating** and co-designing the content and the structures of the project activities, and the second project-period was devoted to the **implementation** of the initiative. The project managers worked on the initiative full time. Some of the learnings have been shared internally within the municipality, and further evolved or modified into other departments. More than 26,000 young people participated in the project.

"Food Maker" used different approaches and methods to reach its target group, include citizens and co-create project activities. One method was to **use Facebook as a platform to reach out to the target group (age 16 – 29)** with '**Food Maker' as the public profile** rather than the Aarhus municipality, in order to make it more

appealing to the intended users. Another tool was the **creation of a Youth Panel**, aimed at ensuring a close co-development of the project. Participants volunteered to be panel members and tended to be individuals who had already shown a strong degree of engagement.

The idea of the Food Maker initiative was that **young people from Aarhus should take ownership of the project**, while co-creating the content of the project activities together with its managers.

Overall, the involvement and collaboration of other stakeholders was key to the success of the project. Different **knowledge and private institutions and NGOs worked closely together with Food Maker**. A significant example is the collaboration between Food Maker and the Danish Refugee Aid Youth (D'funk) - in which some of the Food Maker methodologies were adapted for young refugees in Denmark, by actively involving the participants in the content design phases of project activities.

The **learnings and methodologies** ensuing from the involvement of citizens and the co-creation of processes were **shared through informal networks among officers from different departments within the municipality** and adapted in other areas and projects, supporting a general participatory approach in new initiatives and policies.

b) Barcelona

Barcelona Food Policy/World Sustainable Food Capital 2021

Barcelona (1,6 M inhabitants) started to develop a food policy in 2015. Over the following years, energy and resources were mostly concentrated on defining ambitions and guiding principles for the policy. In 2021, the Council's action was set within the formal framework of hosting the MUFPP (Milan Urban Food Policy Pact) Global Forum and Barcelona becoming World Sustainable Food Capital. This gave the food policy, and initiatives and projects associated with it, an unprecedented impetus.

For the Council Commissioner for Food Policy, applying for the town to become **World Sustainable Food Capital** was a politically charged move to **foster a cultural shift in which sustainable food production, distribution and consumption were to become central within the urban political arena.**

A crucial aspect of this new stage of development has been ensuring that different **Council departments are aligned** with the principles of sustainability that underpin Barcelona's food policy.

In practical terms, the Council provides **financial and technical support** while collaborating with different stakeholders (NGOs, CSOs, private sector) in the development of a **vast number of projects** related to different aspects of food sustainability. Initially, the department responsible for food policy elaborated some **strategic political guidelines** as priorities to which projects should align, and this constituted the main selection criterion. Secondly, **continuous informal coordination among Council departments** has become instrumental in guaranteeing all projects developed are consistent with these common strategic principles and objectives.

Regarding projects in which vulnerable categories are the main beneficiaries, these also include an active co-creating role for those involved as well as training programs for them, with the aim to **facilitate** the **empowerment of vulnerable citizens**.
Another challenge has been the **conflict** between the **strategic guidelines** the Council has been striving to enact through these projects and **contingent economic interests**, mainly pertaining to specific private sector actors such as retailers.

Lack of interest or understanding from potential collaborators, especially producers, was also a relevant initial challenge. To overcome this kind of resistance, the Council focussed on pinpointing relevant individuals within organisations and associations that were already interested in food sustainability. **Framing the policy's objectives in terms of the actors' economic interests and highlighting potential gains** was another approach that helped overcome early resistance.

c) Ghent

Ghent Food Policy ("Ghent en Garde") & Food Policy Council

After first setting the establishment of a Food Policy Council as a policy objective in 2012, the Ghent City Council started a process to create a city-wide food strategy in close collaboration with its citizenry. The town (250,000 inhabitants) has a **long-standing tradition of citizens' active participation** in policy making, and this aspect has remained crucial in the shaping of the **food policy as a pillar of the more general policy transition towards sustainability**. In creating its Food Policy Council, the city took stock both of examples from abroad and of its own past experiences with citizen councils and participatory processes.

The first objective in setting up the **Food Policy Council** was to have a **cross-section of the whole food system**, including representatives from **all relevant sectors**: food production, food consumption, food waste, academia, etc. The president of the Food Council is the vice-mayor of Ghent, who is also responsible for Climate & Environment. There are also four City Council employees covering the general management of the town's food policy and the daily overview and Secretariat of the Council itself. **Organisations representing vulnerable categories** of citizens

(social services, organizations working with migrants, etc.) **are part of the Food Policy Council** and have an active role within it.

External process facilitators have an important role within the Food Policy Council as they manage to enable **constructive discussions and negotiations** to take place, even among stakeholders that traditionally hold opposing views.

About **30 different organisations** are part of the Food Policy Council, which has 5 **strategic objectives**, further split into 20 operational objectives. These were identified by a temporary core team of members of the Food Policy Council and provide the basis for the development of specific policies. Correspondingly, the Council is divided into different **operational working groups**.

The **Food Policy Council has its own budget**, an element which has been **instrumental** in giving members a sense **of empowerment and effectiveness**. This is relevant as one of the main challenges has been ensuring actors remain active and involved in specific activities and in the overall process, which can be difficult as policy making processes can be long and Council members may not be able to pick up on the impact their work has on the general development of the town's food policy.

In operational terms, the Council is characterised by an **informal approach**, ensuring that its role can be **adapted to contingent aims** and requirements. In this sense, while it generally operates as a sounding board for the town's policy making, it may also initiate projects or other kinds of actions whenever it deems it appropriate.

In communicating with citizens and stakeholders about the Food Policy Council and the specific initiatives that are part of the food policy, Ghent City Council adopts a **practical approach**, focussing communications and marketing on **concrete actions** that can transform relevant behavioural patterns.

In the case of Ghent, **publicly stating that the town has a food strategy** had a catalysing effect both within the administration and among citizens. In what was described as a **snowballing effect**, food gradually climbed to the top of politicians' agendas, the city became an "attraction pole" for sustainable businesses and organisations covering issues related to food systems, and CSOs reacted by staying active and involved, while the available knowledge and shared experience on the matter kept growing. Furthermore, having a **clear operating framework** means other Council departments can easily refer to it in developing their own policies, and ensures previous policy achievements remain solid through changing legislation.

d) Glasgow

<u>Glasgow City Food Plan and local partnerships</u>

Glasgow is the largest city in Scotland (600.000 inhabitants) and has adopted a city-wide food strategy in 2019, the Glasgow City Food Plan, initiated in the context of a food summit held by the City Council. The **Glasgow Food Policy Partnership** or 'Good Food for All' was then established and around **80 people** took part in the development process. These citizens represented **different organisations and community groups in Glasgow.** The process was disrupted by the **Covid-pandemic,** however the City Council reacted by holding a series of **online workshops** and sent out **targeted surveys**, to which it received a good number of responses. Thus, the City Council managed to give **continuity to participatory processes in unusual circumstances.**

Despite the challenges of facing a pandemic, changing, and adapting the participatory processes' practices to the current situation, the **Food Plan agreement was finalised in May 2021 through the Community Planning Partnership, another citywide partnership that provides the structure bringing together all relevant agencies at their senior level, and in which the City Council is a key member.** Multiple events and emerging issues have led to the development of the Food Policy Partnership.

A couple of years ago, one of the Council committees analysed the issue of food inequality in Glasgow. At the same time, further discussions about adopting a systemic outlook on food in Glasgow were being carried out within the Food Policy Partnership.

The ten locally based *Food Pantries* that are either operational or about to kick off are a good example of one of the initiatives related to the Food Plan in Glasgow. The initiative is rooted in local partnerships and has two objectives and co-beneficiaries: to help people engage - with a low membership fee - and at the same time prevent surpluses/food waste in supermarkets.

e) Wroclaw

Wroclaw (800,000 inhabitants) is a municipality in Western Poland. Its 'Sustainable Development Department' manages the municipality's sustainable development projects and is currently elaborating a climate change adaptation plan.

The municipality has **long-standing experience** with the involvement of citizens and other stakeholders in projects and strategies. Participatory processes are coordinated between relevant departments and a **central municipal 'Participatory Office'**. The Participatory Office has experience, networks, budget, and tools to

support citizen and stakeholder involvement. Among other things, the Office runs a webpage dedicated to public participatory processes, where all current projects and processes can be viewed.

The municipality uses **three overall approaches to include citizens' perspectives**:

- **District councils**, consisting of people elected by citizens in each district and sometimes representing the district in municipal decision-making processes
- **Civic panels**, consisting of 75 randomly selected residents. The panel members discuss topics relevant for the municipality and produce a report that is taken into consideration in policy decision-making.
- *Ad hoc* **processes and/or questionnaires** established for each project or initiative. Among other things, the municipality has collaborated with a local university's 'Urban Planning' programme, in which students cooperated with the municipality in planning and implementing participatory processes for citizens

The municipality often follows the **same overall approach in different participatory processes**. In the following, this is described through the development of the climate change adaptation plan:

'*The first thing is to inform about the project. We share this information on our websites and local radio and TV, in public transport or wherever we can reach people. We also inform about how the process of the public consultation will look like. So people know in advance that for example there's going to be a series of meetings that are dedicated to this and that, and there is usually a questionnaire on the website.*' (Urban planner in the Sustainable Development Department)

To reach marginalised citizens, the municipality has experimented different approaches. In previous processes with strong citizen involvement, the department observed that some residents unexpectedly came to act as **informal local leaders**, who successfully involved other residents. Based on this observation, the Participatory Office initiated a project aimed at empowering local leaders, particularly focussing on disadvantaged districts. This included **training in fundraising**, **engaging other citizens**, and **facilitating a network**. Some of these local leaders have become **central partners for the involvement of disadvantaged groups.**
In spite of this, it also emerged that there are groups of people who are very difficult to involve in participatory processes and who mainly engage at times in which they disagree with the decisions that are being made – and often at a later stage, when it is too late and decisions cannot be revised.

Beyond a focus on the involvement of citizens, the municipality emphasises **collaboration with NGOs, experts and stakeholders**. In this sense, **9-10 advisory**

bodies consisting of relevant stakeholders from academia, design, planning and other relevant professions have been established.

One of the lessons learned from working systematically both with citizen and stakeholder participation is that they sometimes tend to have **differing objectives** and that their perspectives can be difficult to merge:

'[…] *the academia, the scientists, […] they think of moral problems and how to solve them for all citizens. When it comes to citizens, sometimes they just focus on the problems they want to solve through their participation, and not necessarily think about a public good. And when it comes to NGO's, some issues are either black or white.*' (Urban planner in the Sustainable Development Department)

Another element which has emerged is that it is important to **clarify what participants can expect from their engagement** throughout the process, and to be realistic about its potential outcomes.

In the municipality's experience, it is easier to motivate citizens to participate in agendas and **issues that they feel are closely linked to their everyday lives**. More abstract issues which only indirectly influence citizens often have scant participation beyond few very dedicated or activist citizens. It is therefore important to clarify to potential participants how the current policy processes are relevant to their lives.

Civil society and other organisations

After looking at examples of urban institutional perspectives on food-based participatory processes, the following section is dedicated to experiences recounted either by civil society organisations or by NGOs.
Taking into consideration these viewpoints allowed us to integrate additional knowledge and lessons learned that should be kept into account when attempting to initiate participatory approaches to policy making at the urban level.
CSOs and NGOs transpire as crucial actors in such courses of action, bringing citizens' priorities to the forefront of policy making and contributing instructive insights and know-how on citizen outreach and participation, as well as specific expertise on given topics.

a) Agricola Mpidusa

Agricola Mpidusa (Associazione Terra!)

After about five years of activity organising community gardens on the island of Lampedusa (6,500 inhabitants), the association Terra! paired up with several other partners and founded the **social cooperative** "Agricola Mpidusa". The key aim of this project was **setting up ecologic community vegetable patches on neglected**

public land in and around the town of Lampedusa, all along also focussing on the **social inclusion** of different groups of citizens, including patients from the town day care centre, local youth and citizens on probation.

The first and most important **challenge** was setting up a mainly agricultural initiative in an area in which, over the past decades, **agriculture** has been gradually **replaced by tourism** as the main economic activity. Indeed, only a few old farmers were left on Lampedusa when the project kicked off in 2020. The contribution of these old farmers and their families has been crucial, as they have provided support both financially and in terms of knowledge.

One structural challenge is making the co-operative's activity **financially sustainable**. Furthermore, and to this end, a lot of the work is providing agricultural, administrative and communications training to its members so that the co-operative may become completely independent.

The inclusion of academia, civil society, and environmental associations as active members of the cooperative has allowed it to **directly consider the needs of the citizenship within a coherent frame of action** centred around local agricultural practices and environmental imperatives. The initiative is privately funded by two different foundations, whereas **local authorities provide support mainly by entrusting the public land to the association**. The municipality is small and confronted with substantial problems related to illegal migration, so it has so far not been able to provide further backing.

The co-operative sought the **support of external professionals** for an initial phase of marketing and communication, but given the size of the community, word-of-mouth has so far been the most efficient medium for dissemination. Although citizens were initially doubtful, Terra!'s previous experience in initiating similar projects, their collaboration with the local historical Legambiente chapter, but especially the **inclusion of local families and the town day care centre as core members of the cooperative**, allowed the project to kick off and become part of the urban fabric.

One of the most notable elements of this initiative is indeed the **inclusion of people with disabilities from the Lampedusa day care centre**. The members of Terra! active in the cooperative and staff from the day care centre have been collaborating since the very inception of the cooperative itself so as to ensure that *guests from the centre may fully participate in activities*. **Their participation in the activities organised by the co-operative in the community patches has greatly increased their visibility within the whole community**, and over the past year, various other initiatives and activities have been organised for them.

b) Food Policy Council Cologne

The Food Policy Council in Cologne (1.000.000 inhabitants) was initiated with **seed money from the municipality**, specifically from the Department of the Environment, and was the first Food Policy Council in Germany along with the Food Policy Council in Berlin.

The involvement and close collaboration with the head of the Department of the Environment was an important part of the Cologne Food Policy Council's success, which has led to a formal **decision in the City Council to support the initiative financially and by collaborating on projects**.

A basic model that the Food Policy Council has followed with success is to establish **thematic working groups** in order to organise the interests and focus points of the Council. The group working on food education and food distribution in kindergartens and primary schools put a strong focus on involving the municipality very early on, by contacting the relevant employee in the Department for Youth and Education and thereby gaining collaboration with the working group that connected all the kindergartens in the city.

'[…] they presented themselves, presented their work, presented their ideas for sustainable regional food in kindergartens and good education that could build on it […] and from that they developed a project. They sought funding externally […] and now there's two project staff employed by the Food Policy Council, who work on this project and supporting the volunteers that are working on this inside the Food Policy Council.' (AW)

The Food Policy Council has since followed the same **methodology** successfully: **defining working groups inside the Council, looking for the appropriate counterpart within the municipality, initiating collaborations and looking for potential external funding to support the work.**

From 2017 the City Council has funded a fulltime coordinator's position and costs of office. From 2020 this was expanded to three fulltime positions. Furthermore, the Food Policy Council in Cologne has also managed to obtain funding for projects from other sources.

Food Policy Council Network

The **Food Policy Councils** in Cologne and Berlin quickly gained attention from the public, activist and political environments. The **idea spread to other cities** and countries and new Food Policy Councils were initiated within a few years. The new Food Policy Councils did not have much experience or set procedures to follow, leading to an increasing **need for information and sharing of experiences**. They particularly turned to the two established Councils in Cologne and Berlin for support and inspiration. However, since the Food Policy Councils mainly consisted of

volunteers, it was challenging to take on such supervision and facilitation tasks. A **congress was therefore set up to establish a network** between the initiatives and a **peer-learning** community.

The network has the purpose of facilitating peer-to-peer exchange, as well as contributing to public and political debates with one voice. It consists of food policy councils as well as founding initiatives aiming to establish formalised food policy councils. Most of the members are within this latter category. However, since the network is not yet a formal organisation, there is no set procedure for becoming a member.

'(...) we don't define in much detail what a Food Policy Council must look like, they can set up their own structures and their own ways of working, but of course there will be minimal requirements in terms of subscribing to democratic principles, those kinds of things.' (AW)

The network is currently in the process of becoming a formal organisation, and its future structure should envision a network secretariat and an umbrella structure in which the food policy councils are enrolled as members.

Until the end of 2020 the network was financed by the German Ministry of the Environment, but it currently runs without funding and thereby fully depends on volunteer work. Consequently, activities have been moving at a slower pace.
Based on the experiences drawn from the different Food Policy Councils or founding initiatives that are part of the network, some **shared characteristics, potentials and challenges can be identified.**
AW explains that **Food Policy Councils are mostly initiated by civil society and therefore have strong roots in civic engagement.**
However, Food Policy Councils typically **differ from other citizen-driven initiatives** because of the types of stakeholders involved. Indeed, **the idea is to bring all relevant stakeholders together**, including professionals, activists, researchers, civil society, local politicians and administrations, etc., therefore constituting multi-stakeholder platforms.
This is both the **main strength and greatest challenge** of the approach, as it sometimes causes difficulties in communication and in identifying common aims and strategies.

The **inclusion of local politicians and administration is especially challenging**:

'Getting the municipalities involved is one of the biggest challenges that most food Policy Councils face. There isn't really anyone in charge, it's not like you go to City Hall and you talk to the person who's in charge of the local food system or local food policy which is why we are starting so many food policy councils. So you have a bit of a chicken and egg problem.

Another important learning is that relying on volunteer work affects the potentials of what can and cannot be done. It should be integrated in the structure from the outset, thus identifying aims, timelines and tasks that can realistically be carried out through volunteer work.

Another shared experience is that **involving marginalised groups can present serious challenges**, and these individuals are often underrepresented in the work of the Food Policy Councils. This is especially the case when the aim is to develop policy or action plans rather than projects. **Projects with a practical and/or concrete aim might therefore serve as a productive first step towards wider participation.**

c) Slow Food Barcelona

<u>Citizen's participation for long term sustainability</u>

Slow Food Barcelona was founded in 2005 and has been trying to raise awareness around sustainable food systems and practices since. Its main activity so far has been the Earth Market, a **farmers' market** that was set up six years ago. After initial resistance from local authorities and a general lack of interest from the citizenship, the **interest shown by some institutional representatives and the growing sensitivity of citizens regarding environmental issues helped pave the way for its kick-off.** Contacts with a few key **institutional actors** who act as "**access points**" have indeed proven to be crucial.

Since Barcelona was named Capital of Sustainable Food 2021, Slow Food Barcelona has increasingly been involved in various projects by the local institutions, mainly in a consulting capacity, as well as receiving expressions of interest from the private sector. Although this growing interest is viewed as a positive development, it does pose an important challenge, as different actors need to be carefully evaluated before and during any potential collaboration. In any case, inclusiveness and cooperation between different organizations has generally produced good results, including increased citizen support.

This aspect of consistency is particularly relevant, as **Slow Food's experience in Barcelona has allowed it to pinpoint citizen support as a key enabler for ongoing presence and action**. To gain such support, which is rooted in that growing public sensitivity mentioned above, **consistency with the organisation's guiding principles has been shown to be key.**

Another important aspect mentioned is economic sustainability. While **projects** may be designed to take into consideration aspects of environmental sustainability, it is also crucial for them to be **economically viable**.

A further **enabler** that has emerged is Barcelona's long **tradition of citizen activism** and involvement in different phases of policy making. This element has been

bolstered by the framing of all relevant initiatives in the formal setting of the World Capital of Sustainable Food. Such a framework has shown to provide a strong incentive to public support both for new and existing projects and organisations. The overall objective for Slow Food Barcelona is for all good practices initiated this year to contribute to creating a solid base for a long-term transition towards a more sustainable urban food system rather than dying out at the end of the year.

d) Slow Food Rome

Creating a Food Policy for Rome

Over a two-year period starting in 2019, **50 different NGOs and CSOs** active in the city of Rome (2.8 M inhabitants), including Slow Food Rome, elaborated a **text for the creation of a Food Council** that would then have to become responsible for the development of a **participatory urban food policy**. The process was initially launched by two NGOs, that were quickly joined by others, and each contributed with insights and practical support regarding their specific sector of interest and expertise. The fundamental recognition at the root of the process is that **food is a political matter**, that horizontally affects a multitude of actors and issues and **should therefore be addressed holistically and inclusively**. The actors involved initiated the process because they believed that as a capital, and particularly as the European capital that disposes of the most agricultural land, **Rome was in dire need for a systemic food policy. Local authority involvement in this process** – specifically that of the relevant departments within the City Council – was **instrumental** as the first goal of the initiative was that of getting a resolution approved, to provide the Food Council and policy with legal bases.

While recognising the 2015 Milan process as the original input for the creation of an urban food policy, the movement in Rome highlights its **bottom-up structure** and development as **a key factor in the creation of a successful and inclusive policy**. In such a framework, various actors representing civil society took part in drafting the text that would then be submitted to the City Council, such as academics, producers, and agricultural entrepreneurs.
Given the nature of the process, centred on designing a formal text covering very specific matters, vulnerable stakeholders were not actively part of the process but key expected beneficiaries of the final outcome.

The project was very well received by the City Council, and a facilitator of access to the urban institutional process was the fact that **stakeholders were able to rely on some key institutional actors that functioned as entry points** and promoted the process in institutional fora.

Nevertheless, once the draft gained access and was set to be voted on within the Council, development of the process stagnated, with a resolution on the creation of a Food Council and urban food policy only being voted in over a year after the

text had originally been taken into consideration. While this was partly ascribed to difficulties resulting from pandemic-related restrictions, the movement also found that there was an overall **lack of expertise** among those officials responsible for relevant issues and departments.

The Food Council is expected to be central to the creation of horizontal urban food policies covering the different branches of the food system. In doing so, the Food Council will necessarily maintain a strong grassroots participation at all levels while cooperating synergistically with municipal actors so that policies may be appropriately implemented.

Free HACCP courses for migrant women

For the past two years, Slow Food Rome has been running courses for migrant women that focus on **sensory and nutritional education**. At the end of the courses, **the women obtain an HACCP** (a risk management system that identifies, evaluates, and controls hazards related to food safety throughout the food supply chain) **certificate**, **which potentially widens their employment prospects.**
The courses take place on Saturday mornings so as not to impinge on work engagements and a small, open-air play centre is set up to facilitate participation of single mothers.

Synergistic collaboration with other associations, particularly those active within schools, allows Slow Food Rome to get in touch with potential participants, and positive past experiences are passed on through word of mouth, also increasing the initial level of trust towards the organisation.

Beyond the practical benefit of obtaining the HACCP certificate, the women have also benefitted from **building a sense of community** with other participants, moving quickly on from initial shyness and reticence. The courses have garnered the support of local municipality representatives and are expected to continue taking place in their current setup in the upcoming years.

3. Thematic clusters and main findings

While the case studies synthesised above are substantially diverse, important structural and operational commonalities emerged when analysing them. Significantly, such commonalities also stood out in the responses to the online survey relating to similar urban participatory initiatives. **Four aspects seemed to be particularly relevant in view of the possible development of similar processes in other urban environments, firstly because they emerged as being the most recurrent, secondly because they can have crucial operational relevance in ensuring such processes develop successfully.**

Below, these elements have been condensed so as to pinpoint their most salient features and facilitate operationalisation. Concrete references to examples from the case studies and the survey have been made to provide further clarification.

Participatory methodologies

Throughout the different case studies and the survey, different participatory approaches and methodologies for developing urban food policies emerged. However, the degree of and approaches to participation, as well as who participates in policy processes at the urban level differ from case to case. The **participatory methodologies identified** were mainly aimed at **involving citizens** in policy processes, however **other stakeholders such as NGOs, knowledge institutions and private sector stakeholders were mentioned as collaborators and participants** on different levels in all relevant cases. Although the participation of citizens was the main focus, the research conducted in this task was from a municipal or organisational point of view, considering their methodologies for involving citizens in food policies at the urban level.

Different models and approaches to citizens' participation emerged and there are great **differences between how municipalities organise participatory processes**. The **Wroclaw** case is an example of a formal and organised municipal approach to participatory processes, with a dedicated Participatory Office with own resources within the municipality, to support other areas and departments on participatory processes. In this case, a department within the municipality supports a **systematic and to some extent centralised approach** to the involvement of citizens at the urban level. **Other cities** have **more informal ways** of involving citizens in policy development. It has transpired that **approaches** to participatory policies are very **context-specific**– being heavily influenced by the city's general policy structures, as well as by the tradition of citizen inclusion.

In the case of **Ghent**, for example, there is a **strong tradition** of including citizens in different aspects of municipal work, whilst in the case of Wroclaw, the Participatory Office is a part of the current strategy of the city's elected politicians. In the case of **Glasgow**, working with the participation and inclusion of citizens is supported by a **strategy at the national level**.

Whether a city has a strong tradition or is new to working with participatory policies, there is **overall agreement on the importance of trying to involve all** (or at least most) **relevant stakeholders** in participatory urban food-based policies. The methodologies on how to involve citizens differ from city to city and are carried out through both formal and informal municipal structures and practices. Some cities have examples of an established Food Policy Council in which multiple stakeholders are represented. Other cities might collaborate or involve stakeholders in different stages of the policy development or through various projects or initiatives.

In the city of Cologne and the coordinated network of Food Policy Councils in German-speaking countries, the interviewee stressed that **involving all relevant stakeholders, and citizens in general, is a challenge**, a point iterated in other cases. As an example, it was mentioned how it can be **difficult to have farmers** participating in the policy processes as they have different working hours and everyday lives compared to many city inhabitants and would have to physically commute to the city for meetings or workshops. However, **farmer participation is crucial to support urban-rural linkages** as key factors in food systems, which is why it is very important to involve farmers in food-based policies. The case of Glasgow illustrates how the involvement of stakeholders and their collaboration with the municipality can happen systematically through formal networks and partnerships.

Throughout the different cases, the cities underlined that they are working towards more inclusive policy processes (food-based or not). They find it challenging, but in cases such as Ghent and Cologne, **having a more inclusive approach to food-based urban policies was key to developing more 'effective' or 'better' policies** because of the involvement of both beneficiaries and other stakeholders – which might **support changes on a more systemic level**. The initiation and coordination of participatory processes might be top-down, or bottom-up, as will be exemplified in some of the following paragraphs.

Food Policy Councils

During the interviews, Food Policy Councils (sometimes just termed "Food Councils") emerged as **the most prominent medium for the enactment of food-based urban participatory policy processes.**

Over the past decade or so, urban Food Councils have been **emerging across Europe at an accelerating pace** and have in each case taken on specific structures and operating characteristics. While Councils vary considerably in a number of relevant aspects, **cross-cutting challenges, enablers and opportunities** did emerge during the interviews.

First and foremost, **Food Councils differ depending on whether they are initiated by CSO/NGO coalitions (bottom-up structures) or by local public authorities, e.g. municipalities (top-down structures).** In the first case scenario, they tend to develop in order to "fill a gap", be it a policy gap or a gap in available expertise, at the institutional level. Namely, while a need is perceived by a consistent part of the citizenry, it is not matched by corresponding policy making at the municipal level. This was the case in Rome, where a coalition of fifty different organisations cooperated over two years to create a proposal for the creation of a Food Council and an urban food policy in order to meet the growing and interlinked needs multiple stakeholders operating within the food system felt were not being met by any existent municipal policy or department.

In either case, **municipalities can choose how they want to interact with the Food Councils**: whether to offer technical and/or financial support, whether to be actively involved in them and so on. In those case studies in which we were told about Food Councils, it emerged that **support from public authorities is instrumental in various different ways**. The two most fundamental and immediate ways in which local authorities can grant support to Food Policy Councils relate to **providing the Council's work with legal bases**, thus formally framing its role within the policy making process, and **financially supporting its activities**. Funding can be provided in different ways and measures. In the case of the Cologne Food Policy Council, the municipality initially funded a full-time coordinating position, whereas in other cases local authorities chose to support specific projects and activities carried out by the Food Councils, as is the case in Barcelona.

In this respect, **identifying key institutional actors who can and are willing to offer support, acting as "access points" is crucial for bottom-up Council development**, as pointed out by the interviewees both from the German network of Food Councils and from the budding Roman Council. In the case of top-down processes, equally, the corresponding relevance of specific committed individuals within the institutional structure emerged, as in the case of Ghent.

Having a **long-standing culture of citizen participation in policy design** transpired as one general **contingent enabler for the initiation of participatory policy making processes channelled through Food Councils**. This kind of framework also facilitates the interaction between CSOs/NGOs and local authorities, as the need to pinpoint institutional "entry points" is diminished by **pre-existing relationships** and channels for communication and collaboration.

Furthermore, the fact that the citizenry and institutions have a history of cooperation on policy design processes usually entails there is a **body of knowledge** related to past experiences which can be drawn on in initiating any new project or mechanism. This was the case with the Ghent Food Policy Council, which drew both from the examples of Food Councils abroad and from its own examples of participatory Councils.

Lessons learned and knowledge garnered from previous experiences emerged as being a key element even beyond municipal boundaries. During the interview with the representative from the Cologne Food Council, networking between Councils was highlighted as being instrumental in **disseminating information and sharing knowledge**. Indeed, while individual actions for dissemination require considerable funds and time, which are often not abundant in bottom-up structures, scheduling occasional dedicated networking events allows for efficient and concentrated exchange of information, without weighing down on participants' available time and resources.

In operational terms, two more practical insights which emerged in one or more case studies seem worthy of being highlighted at this stage.

Firstly, while Councils are initiated to pursue a set of wide-ranging overarching objectives, both in the top-down and in the bottom-up examples, interviewees stressed the **practical benefits of splitting the Council into working groups** in its day-to-day activity. These should be focussed on accomplishing more **specific, functional aims,** derived from the wider, long-term ones, and attuned with the interests and expertise of the particular Food Council members covering their achievement. In the Flemish case, this *modus operandi* was identified as increasing efficiency and focus of the Food Council's action.

Secondly, a couple of interviewees underlined the **importance of ensuring that citizens taking part in these processes feel that they have a concrete impact on urban policies**. This relates both to a more general impression of "being heard" and taken seriously by local authorities and to the recognition of the process' impact on policy development, which can often take a considerable amount of time and be difficult to identify in its individual components for external actors.

Both in relation to whether and how to initiate the development of a Food Policy Council and in relation to the shaping of the collaboration between public authorities and other participating actors, it is important for municipalities to recognise that these stem from cognizant political choices. As mentioned earlier, the **need for dedicated, horizontal urban food policies** and for these to be rooted in participatory processes is increasingly being expressed by grassroots movements and coalitions across Europe. **Local authorities can choose how to engage with these needs and movements and which role to play in relation to them, and this decision can only originate from active political reflection and coordination**.

Involving vulnerable categories of citizens

Defining which citizens may be termed "vulnerable" or "marginalised" is in itself a complicated matter which has important political implications. These cannot be discussed in depth here, and it will suffice to clarify that in researching this aspect, we mainly referred to: immigrants, lower income families, the elderly, people with disabilities, members of the LGBTQIA+ community.

The active involvement of vulnerable categories of citizens in the design of food-related participatory initiatives, projects or policies at the urban level was one of the aspects which were investigated during this mapping exercise.

Their inclusion is not only **crucial** because it allows **clear identification of their needs** and wishes/intentions, but also because they **provide additional knowledge and experience to the entire process**, contributing to widening the frame of reference of the whole initiative or policy making process. In some cases, their involvement is indeed inevitable, as they are the only ones holding the relevant knowledge. This is true both in general terms (i. e. they are the only ones that should speak for themselves about their priorities) and in more specific ways, such as in the case of a **survey respondent from Koplik, Albania, where rural women were the only ones to have knowledge on the traditional method of cheese processing the project meant to safeguard and certify.**

The specific difficulties related to the involvement of vulnerable subjects vary greatly, especially depending on the category considered and on the type of initiative. The most common **challenges** referred to by interviewees relate to **linguistic barriers, skillsets, lack of perceived relevance of the policy or initiative, lack of time and/or resources** the individuals have available to dedicate to this kind of involvement.

The **Covid-19 pandemic** has also set some additional challenges to this kind of involvement, as highlighted by a survey reply from the city of

Birmingham. The respondent indicated that the outburst of the pandemic in 2020 put a stop to the meetings of the focus groups that had been set up as part of the **Birmingham Food Conversation**, launched a few months earlier. While digital outreach and engagement took over for a prolonged length of time, **some of these groups were cut off from being part of those conversations as they did not have access to the necessary tools and services.**

Framing what we mean by "**active involvement**" is another relevant element to be defined when setting up participatory processes. Quite a few of the projects or policy processes considered envisioned groups of vulnerable citizens as beneficiaries - e.g., projects organising food aid, food parcels, food banks, inclusion in community gardens, assistance for the elderly during pandemic lockdowns etc. - but this did not necessarily entail their active participation in the design of the initiative, in other words, while reaping some concrete benefits from the project or policy, they did not really "have a seat at the table".

In some of the case studies, a **strong element of empowerment is central to the development of the whole enterprise**, as was the case with projects offering professionalising training to specific groups of citizens. One example of this approach was the HACCP certification course that Slow Food Rome has been holding for migrant women for the past couple of years.
While these approaches do offer great advantages, they cannot be classified as "active involvement in the design of participatory policy making processes", even though it is important to stress that these different types of initiatives are not mutually exclusive.

The effective inclusion of vulnerable groups of citizens in the design and management of policies and initiatives did emerge in a couple of case studies. **In Ghent, the social services, along with several associations and organisations representing different vulnerable groups of citizens, are members of the Food Policy Council,** being therefore directly part of the sounding board action exercised by the Council itself. In Lampedusa, the Italian NGO Terra! has put together a number of stakeholders to found a social cooperative which took over two abandoned pieces of land and turned them into vegetable gardens. An important part of the project is the **active involvement of the town's day care Centre both in the administration of the cooperative and through the involvement of its patients** – people with different types of disability – in activities on the land and in some cases in its management.

While the challenges hindering the active participation of vulnerable groups of citizens in drafting policies and projects have already been listed, important **enablers** of such an inclusion did emerge during the mapping process.

One important factor is the facilitating role municipalities can have in this respect. **Local institutions can provide both financial and technical support to the**

involvement of vulnerable categories of citizens in projects they are coordinating, taking part in or financing.

Another element that emerged was the **need for communication relating to the initiative to be kept as concrete as possible**, illustrating why it might be relevant for people's everyday lives or their interests more generally.

Specific enablers can be devised on a case-to-case basis, as illustrated earlier by the Roman case, in which the scheduling of the activity and offering support in childcare represent good examples of *ad hoc* practical measures that can support citizen engagement.

However, it is crucial to stress that **any kind of support to participation implies a political will and strategic choice to knowingly ensure all relevant stakeholders are involved in the process**. Because there are multiple and diverse structural impediments to this kind of engagement, it will not happen automatically without a cognizant action from those actors initiating the overall project or policy making process.

Structuring and organising – from initiatives to policies

During interviews, the ways in which urban participatory food initiatives are developed into comprehensive policies emerged as being quite diverse and context specific. The interviews were carried out with representatives from very different cities across Europe, in which cultural, political, and structural contexts contribute to making each case study distinct. This is also reflected in how each city structures and organises its work towards the creation of policies.

Some cities referred to the creation of separate working groups to structure the processes of participatory policy making. In the case of the Food Policy Councils' network in German-speaking Countries, the network coordinator stressed how **formalising a Food Policy Council's work into more specialised working groups supports the processes leading to the development of specific ideas and policies**. This more structured approach was also relevant to the experience of the Food Policy Partnership in Glasgow. **With a formal partnership and smaller working groups covering different themes and topics, the working processes become more tangible, which can help structure the progress towards food policies**.

The case of Wroclaw is a very clear example of having a formalised and systematic approach to participatory processes in local policy development. In this case, the

structuring of citizens' inclusion and the practice of sharing project and policy information systematically are institutionalised in work processes through Participatory Offices.

Yet another approach is to use project knowledge in a more structured way, **creating a course from local initiatives to more formal and comprehensive policies**. In the case of Ghent, **project knowledge and learnings from initiatives are systematically included in the development of urban food policy**. Every year, the project results are analysed, and knowledge and learnings are reflected upon within the Food Policy Council. Some project knowledge becomes more formalised and supports new suggestions for or developments in urban food policies.

Other cities use project knowledge less formally, which affects how said knowledge might lead to or affect the development of new policies. In these cases, cities might have multiple different ongoing projects related to food and/or participation of citizens and other stakeholders. Many European cities do not have formal comprehensive food-based urban policies. The lessons learned from the Food Maker Project in **Aarhus** are an **example of a more informal approach** to the use of project knowledge towards the elaboration of policies. In this case, the **knowledge was shared through informal networks within the municipality**. Project Officers identified relevant key actors from other departments and projects to share their experiences with. The lessons learned from the Food Maker Project might have initially been met with scepticism, but the methodologies used in the project were adaptable and inspired new courses of action in other areas of work in the municipality working with participatory approaches. As an example, **methods** used for the **involvement of young citizens** which encouraged them to take ownership of processes, progresses and content in the Food Maker Project were successfully **adapted by the Unemployment Centre**. Aarhus is therefore a good example of how results and lessons learned from one urban project can be referred to in order to support or contribute to the development of more integrated participatory policy practices.

4. Conclusions and recommendations

In this Report, we presented the relevant findings from Task 1.3 of the ongoing Horizon 2020 Food Trails project, under the "Reviewing and mapping of existing good practices" Work Package (WP 1).

After summaries relating to specific case studies that we extrapolated from a number of in-depth interviews carried out over a two-month period, and thematic paragraphs covering the most significant themes and challenges which emerged from these interviews, as well as from a questionnaire we disseminated over the same time span, this section will briefly list **some conclusions and practical recommendations for cities to refer to and take into consideration when building their own participatory policy-building processes.**

These indications are in no way exhaustive, but they do reflect commonalities which emerged from interviewees' and survey respondents' experiences and can therefore provide useful practical inputs to cities attempting to structure food-based urban participatory policy making.

General principles

1. Importance of involving all relevant stakeholders for a truly systemic approach
2. The active involvement of vulnerable citizens is a challenge, but doing so makes for more inclusive and effective food policies because more knowledge and able to identify needs
3. Food Councils can be a valuable instrument for co-creating and implementing participatory processes
4. Having a council department which is formally responsible for encouraging and managing the development of participatory processes within the city greatly facilitates their occurrence
5. An existing tradition or culture of citizen involvement in policy making within the city emerged as being instrumental – although this is context specific and cannot be improvised, it can be encouraged and supported
6. For municipalities, the decision to support and engage with civil society and other stakeholders can only result from a cognisant political choice as it does not happen spontaneously
7. Practical recommendations to help structure and organise individual projects towards the creation of a comprehensive urban policy relate to:

Practical recommendations

- ensuring best practices and experiences are shared among different departments within the municipality, through formal and informal channels
- setting up/supporting a Food Policy Council and splitting it into subject-specific working groups
- systematically communicating and informing stakeholders on ongoing projects
- systematically and informally referring to lessons learned, past experiences, project knowledge and best practices, and sharing these with other municipalities working on similar topics
- collaborating with organisations, academia and external experts to integrate available knowledge and facilitate processes and negotiations
- using platforms such as social media to engage with citizens
- framing the policy objectives in terms of actors' interests and highlighting potential gains and benefits
- ensure civil society can rely on accessible entry points and technical expertise in the municipality when it comes to food related issues
- identify local leaders to act as entry points and engagement catalysers for marginalised groups in local communities

FOOD TRAILS