

**Discussion paper:** Aggregated Food Procurement in Toronto

**Prepared by:** Sally Miller, The Food Flow Project, Parkdale Activity Recreation Centre (PARC)

**Date:** July 21, 2014

## **1. Context and Problem: Food Access Issues in Toronto**

Toronto is home to over 300 agencies that provide food to people who face challenges in food access<sup>1</sup>. Over 6.5 million meals are provided through drop in centres, shelters, supportive housing churches, community health centres and other venues.<sup>2</sup> More than 12% of Canadians are food insecure; 11.9% in Ontario, at least 1 in 10 in Toronto<sup>3</sup>. 61% of food insecure households have employment as the main source of income. These numbers are growing steadily. The sector spends \$29 million annually<sup>4</sup>, not including institutions like hospitals, or the Student Nutrition Program (\$17 million). Food has a significant impact on health, learning outcomes, wellbeing and mental health, and employment access. However, budget cuts have steadily eroded the food budgets of social service agencies. Nonetheless, \$29 million is still a significant amount that is spent on a diversity of items from fresh ingredients to prepared meals.

Each meal provided by Toronto's agencies may be the only meal a person eats that day; nutrition levels in that meal have been shown to be inadequate to meet daily requirements<sup>5</sup>. Food bank offerings as well tend to cover only a few days; each household is limited in how much they can access through a food bank each month<sup>6</sup>. Meal providers rely heavily on donations. In turn, food bank distributors also rely on donations, mostly from supermarkets and food manufacturers. Donations tend to be packaged, often heavy in salt, sugar and other additives. Through the dependence on donation streams, the access to fresh, healthy food is limited. Individual agencies

---

<sup>1</sup> Miller, S. 2013. *Finding Food: Community Food Procurement in the City of Toronto*. Toronto Food Strategy/ Toronto Public Health. December 2013. ; Kamizaki, K. 2013. *Reassembling Community Food Flow: The Making and Remaking of Community Food Distribution and procurement in Toronto's West Central Neighbourhoods*. Community Food Flow Project. Parkdale Activity Recreation Centre (PARC).; Tarasuk, V. And Naomi Dachner. 2009. "The Proliferation of Charitable Meal Programs in Toronto. *Canadian Public Policy—Analyse de Politiques*, Vol. XXXV, No. 4, 2009.

<sup>2</sup> Miller, S. 2013; Dachner, N. 2009. "An Ethnographic Study of Meal Programs for Homeless and Under-Housed Individuals in Toronto". *Journal of Health Care for the Poor and Underserved* 20 (2009): 846–853.

<sup>3</sup> Tarasuk, V. and Andy Mitchell, Naomi Dachner. 2011. *Household Food Insecurity in Canada 2011*; Toronto Public Health. 2010. *Cultivating Food Connections: Towards a Healthy and Sustainable Food System for Toronto*. May 2010.

<sup>4</sup> Food Flow, Tarasuk

<sup>5</sup> Tse, C. and Valerie Tarasuk. 2008. "Nutritional assessment of charitable meal programmes serving homeless people in Toronto". *Public Health Nutrition*. Vol. 11(12), 1296-1305.

<sup>6</sup> Food Banks Canada. 2012. *Hunger Count 2012*.

have addressed the problem through individual projects like urban agriculture, arrangements with the food terminal, etc., but a sector-wide solution is lacking.

Where is the food money spent? Most agencies do not have funding for a chef or food coordinator. Agency practices are resourceful and dedicated, but with limited capacity and resources, results are not always ideal. Purchases are necessarily piecemeal, undertaken at the last minute by the staffperson organizing the program (often a social worker or even an Executive Director without training in food or nutrition). The result is that the most common sources of food for the sector are discount supermarkets that are accessed by walking, taxis, or personal vehicles. Agencies also often rely on large-scale transnational food distributors. Recent research shows that in price and diversity, as well as food quality, these choices are not ideal<sup>7</sup>. In terms of nutrition impact, the results can be improved, as the focus of last minute shopping is often prepared food with many hidden ingredients (salt, sugar, corn syrup, chemical additives, fillers without dietary value).

Community food procurement does not occur in isolation; it is part of a broader context of food system challenges and practices. At the consumer end, almost 4 million Canadians struggle with chronic hunger (from not knowing where their next meal is coming from to missing meals). People with money to spend on food are getting a raw deal, with food-related illnesses up (diabetes, chronic heart problems, obesity-related problems) and food safety crises occurring regularly. One in three Toronto children are reported to be overweight or obese<sup>8</sup>. At the supply end, farmers in Ontario are leaving the profession or retiring while the acreage dedicated to growing food decreases steadily, turned over to housing development, mining and highways<sup>9</sup>. The loss of local production has been accompanied by the loss of infrastructure: local processing,

---

<sup>7</sup> Miller. 2013.

Kamizaki, K. 2013. *Reassembling Community Food Flow: The Making and Remaking of Community Food Distribution and procurement in Toronto's West Central Neighbourhoods*. Community Food Flow Project. Parkdale Activity Recreation Centre (PARC).

<sup>8</sup> Toronto Public Health. 2010. *Cultivating Food Connections: Toward a Healthy and Sustainable Food System for Toronto*.

<sup>9</sup> National Farmers Union. (2011). *Farms, Farmers and Agriculture in Ontario*. Ontario: National Farmers Union. Miller, S. *Places to Farm: Alternative practices and policies for Ontario's changing agricultural landscape*. Jul 2013. Toronto: George Cedric Metcalf Foundation.

local abattoirs, mid-scale distribution, mid-scale storage and local transportation<sup>10</sup>. Both for growers and eaters of food, we face a crisis.

## **2. A Brief History**

How did we get to this situation? A complex web of decisions and practices defines the history of food insecurity. Farming has become more difficult (farmers receive the same for their product in real dollars as they did in the 1970's)<sup>11</sup>. Imported food has become cheaper than locally grown product (often bolstered in the originating country by subsidies to agriculture). Ontario has progressively lost the infrastructure needed for a local food system; parts of the supply chain like processing, distribution and storage have largely disappeared. Wages are stagnant or dropping, so that the people who access community food programs and food banks are often fully employed. Social assistance is often insufficient to cover rent as well as food; people tend to pay rent first to keep a roof over their heads.

## **3. Review of existing solutions**

As Olivier de Schutter, Special Rapporteur on the right to food pointed out, food is not a protected human right in Canada<sup>12</sup>. The response to food insecurity has not reached all the people struggling with food access. Agencies cannot always meet the needs of their community; they do not have good access to fresh, healthy food; and people often hesitate to access food banks or meal programs for a variety of reasons.

However, the community food system is slowly being rebuilt. Solutions include the expanding community food centre model, which achieves dignity in food access by combining meal preparation, urban agriculture engagement and food programming with meal provision. FoodShare combines meal provision (to workers at their food centre) with an extensive Good Food Box program, mobile market, community chef training program, school nutrition programs, and a wholesale fresh produce distribution program.

---

<sup>10</sup> Lyson, Thomas A. and Stevenson, Welsh, eds. (2008). *Food and the Mid-Level Farm: Renewing an Agriculture of the Middle*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: the MIT Press; Carter-Whitney, M. and Sally Miller. *Nurturing Fruit and Vegetable Processing in Ontario Metcalf Food Solutions Papers*. Toronto: Metcalf Foundation.

<sup>11</sup> National Farmers Union. (2011). *Farms, farmers and Agriculture in Ontario*. Ontario: National Farmers Union.

<sup>12</sup> De Schutter, Olivier. 2012. *Report of the Special Rapporteur on the right to food*. United Nations General Assembly. Human Rights Council 22<sup>nd</sup> Session. December 24, 2012. A/HRC/22/50/Add.1.

At the agency level, numerous innovations and solutions exist. Some agencies have worked hard to fund a food coordinator using diverse funding streams. Some have developed in-house methods to coordinate orders for a range of programs. Many agencies rely on participants for cooking, providing mentoring and skills training while cooking for the agency meal programs. Some agencies, particularly outside the downtown core, have turned to growing their food themselves or partnering with a farming project. One agency coordinates all food activities through a weekly food committee. Some agencies, particularly faith-based programs, rely on long-time volunteers for cooking and procurement as well. In several cases, grocery shopping is an integral part of participation, providing training in budgeting and meal-planning as well as meal preparation.

Research from the Food Flow project and for Toronto Public Health in 2013 identified several significant gaps in these solutions. The focus is on getting meals on the table each day. In most cases, agencies are not able to manage supply carefully (for instance, by comparing prices at different suppliers, or developing relations with wholesale suppliers). In addition, the sector lacks convenient responses to spikes in volume (of donations or of fresh seasonal food). The sector tends to lack storage and processing options at the agency sites, and are not able to redistribute large volume donations among themselves. These are problems of collaboration and aggregation; they can be met with collaborative solutions. In a series of consultations, partner meetings and communications, Food Flow and other stakeholders have begun to develop various collaborative solutions that meet the gaps in the community food sector.

#### **4. Partners in Development of Solutions**

Food Flow has been fortunate in the development of a strong advisory group and partners from across the sector, from food bank distributors, to large agencies providing regular meals, to Toronto's Public Health unit to community food centre representatives. Their input has been invaluable in identifying potential and existing solutions. Solutions can include expanding existing programs (such as FoodShare's wholesale program, which currently only reaches a few of the agencies) or implementing new ones (such as the proposed Food Flow Kitchen, a social enterprise model for commercial processing). The hundred or so agencies reached during the 2013 research showed interest and some capacity to participate in the solutions and

recommendations put forward for the sector. Food Flow is engaging in another round of consultations to discuss more concrete collaborative initiatives.

Important existing programs include Creating Health Plus, a model program that responds to the inadequate nutrient levels available to drop in centres. Creating Health Plus provides dairy, eggs and some fruits and vegetables to participating drop in centres. So far the program has increased nutrient levels at twenty-eight drop ins, and is reviewing ways to expand. Partners such as Toronto Public Health and PARC have also begun to explore aggregated procurement through an online model (“portal”) that would allow multiple suppliers to offer products through a centralized service.

#### Questions for Discussion

- What other partners are involved in similar projects or should be consulted?
- What similar programs aggregate procurement for multiple agencies currently in Canada or North America?
- Is there a potential for partnering with the efforts of similar programs (for instance, with the Ontario Association of Food Banks)?

### **5. Guiding Principles**

As partners search for collaborative solutions, values and guiding principles have emerged that are at the heart of these initiatives. The **values** include: equitability, value (quality for price), timeliness, freshness, local and organic origins. The **guiding principles** include equity and fairness among agencies, transparency, freshness, fair pricing, nutrient levels and consultation among partners and agencies. Food Flow has engaged in ongoing consultations and discussions across the sector, as well as financial and strategic planning for shared solutions.

#### Questions for Discussion

- What are other values that are priorities for this sector?
- What are other guiding principles that are relevant to the community food sector or to aggregated procurement for the sector?

### **6. Aggregation of services and solutions**

Many proposed services to address the gaps and shortfalls in the sector can be most effective in an aggregated model. If access to the supply chain is improved and agencies are able to purchase more directly (wholesale or even direct from farmers), then it would be useful to aggregate the procurement through an ordering mechanism (like an online service or on-the-ground salespeople), a distributor to combine orders for a single delivery, and a storage facility (warehouse) to handle volume procurement for better pricing. In addition, given the length of Ontario's growing season and the uneven availability of product both locally and in donations of fresh product from other venues, access to commercial processing to smooth the flow of food into the winter and from week to week is also relevant. The closer the processing is to production (local farms or even urban-based agriculture) and to distribution, the lower the costs of the operation. There is a need for distribution and processing that matches the needs and scale of the sector.

The solution for discussion in this paper is a physical centre that combines aggregated procurement from farmers, online ordering for agencies, an ability to combine streams of food (perhaps both donated and purchased) to recipients, and the capacity to process surplus amounts of either donated or purchased food. A commercial processing facility offers the opportunity for on-the-job training and mentoring for a sector that is reportedly in need of skilled workers (food processing)<sup>13</sup>. The facility has the potential to offer a mobile kitchen that can process on-site for farms and agencies; this can address the various bottlenecks around transportation (as well as offering an excellent opportunity for promotion of the project)<sup>14</sup>.

## **7. Models for Aggregated Procurement**

Aggregated procurement means that social service agencies would be able to purchase a diversity of items from one or two sources at improved wholesale level pricing, instead of using multiple vendors or relying on higher retail level prices. It allows the agencies to pool their purchasing power to improve pricing. Centralized procurement can be organized in a number of

---

<sup>13</sup> City of Toronto. 2004. *Toronto Labour Force Readiness Plan: The Food Processing Industry in the Toronto Region*; National Seafood Sector Council. 2005. *Overview of the Food Processing Industry: Executive Summary*. Ottawa, ON: November 2005.

<sup>14</sup> This option is explored in the *Food Flow Kitchen Feasibility Study* produced for PARC in 2014 (Miller). See also: N. C. Doty and Associates. 2009. *Mobile Food Processing Unit Feasibility Study*. For North Dakota Department of Agriculture. July 2009.

different ways. Agencies can 1) access the food by purchasing from the centre as a standard wholesale distributor. The organization can also 2) operate as a non-profit or charitable organization with agency members (much like Daily Bread). Agencies could also 3) act as members of a central co-operative. This model would be similar to the Ontario Natural Food Co-op (ONFC), now one of the largest natural food distributors in Eastern Canada. ONFC was originally formed by buying clubs and food co-ops and later natural food stores. The individual stores alone were not able to purchase in enough volume alone to access the organic and natural foods they needed.

Each of these models requires a separate governance structure.

### Questions for Discussion

- What are other relevant examples of aggregated procurement for a sector?
- In what way are U.S. models (like FoodlinkNY, or even Feeding America) relevant or not?
- What are similar models that might be useful for part or all of the Toronto context?
- What are the pros and cons of a member-based model?

## 9. Services

The aggregation centre can provide the following services:

- Centralized ordering for agencies to reduce the time and inefficiency of ordering or shopping at grocery stores
- Access for agencies to donated food as well as food for purchase
- Storage for farm surplus in season
- Processing for farm surplus in season (on-farm or at the centre)
- Aggregated purchasing from suppliers to achieve better pricing for agencies
- Reduction in duplication of deliveries to the same site
- Reduction in ordering duplication by agencies
- Shared storage for bulk purchases for agencies
- Transparency in pricing for agencies to compare suppliers easily
- Increase in local food flowing to Toronto's agencies
- Increase in access to fresh, healthy food for agencies

- Training and mentoring for high quality food industry jobs
- Training and education to increase nutrition levels of meals

#### Questions for Discussion

- What other services can be mobilized through collaboration and aggregated procurement?
- Which of the services are most important? Which might be optional?
- Which of the services are more likely to access start-up funding or support?
- Which services would have the greatest impact on the sector?

### **10. Potential Product and Supply**

Initial research for Toronto Public Health (2013) proposed a core group of items that tend to be accessed by agencies. A number of considerations are factored into the product list agencies tend to need. These include convenience, nutrition, member preference, food safety and familiarity. In many cases, agencies purchase prepared foods with less healthy ingredients due to lack of time for food preparation, lack of access to better choices, or lack of knowledge. Centralized procurement can address many of these issues collaboratively through one-on-one discussions, trainings and online resource development (healthy recipes, best practices, etc.).

Centralized purchasing may also develop potential purchasing options that are not currently available; more access to local, fresh foods, a wider range of dairy options, bulk purchases of protein. Centralized processing of surplus will increase access to local foods, providing new locally grown products to replace imported options (for instance, canned tomatoes).

#### Questions for Discussion

- What food categories should aggregated procurement focus on?
- What practices and networks already exist in procurement that could be accessed, developed or expanded?

### **11. Existing Assets and Capacity**

Although individual agencies struggle with budget cuts, reduced donations and loss of capacity in the sector, overall the sector has significant assets that can support collaborative solutions. These include under-utilized storage (including freezer and refrigeration), some under-utilized



trucks, available commercial kitchens, kitchens that are under-utilized due to permitting issues, and available commercial equipment that is appropriate scale for mid-size processing.

Important expertise also exists in the sector, including highly trained chefs, fund-raisers, governance experts and food industry knowledge.

The sector tends to lack the mechanisms, practices and processes that allow the aggregation and collaborative use of these resources. Some agencies report inadequate kitchen space while others nearby have kitchens that are available for part of the week. Coordinating use and transport among agency kitchens may be a challenge, but the potential for some neighbourhood solutions is there. In addition, expertise is not evenly distributed or shared, as there are limited mechanisms for knowledge sharing among the agencies. Some agencies identify menu-planning with a dietician as a need. Others have dieticians on staff but the expertise has not been linked to the sectoral need in a formal way that reaches all agencies easily.

Existing networks tend to be focused on type of service. The drop in centres are organized to some extent in the Toronto Drop In Network (TDIN). Not all drop in meal programs are part of this network; Toronto has an estimated 200 or so drop in meal programs and only 51 are members of TDIN<sup>15</sup>. The shelters are organized under city departments, although there is quite a lot of variation in their funding streams and requirements for food procurement. Faith-based organizations have their own networks. Community Health Centres are organized in their own networks as well. However, the overlap in needs around food procurement for all these organizations that provide meals at little or no charge indicates the potential for a broad alliance around food.

Organization around food issues has occurred through the innovative Creating Health Plus network, which has the potential to expand and act as the base for broader coalitions around food. Toronto Food Strategy also provides links to all community food sectors through its various projects and through the 2013 community food procurement project<sup>16</sup>. The opportunity

---

<sup>15</sup> Miller, S. 2013.

<sup>16</sup> Miller, S. 2013.

exists for the sector to organize to improve procurement, to exchange expertise, and to mobilize existing resources more effectively.

#### Questions for Discussion

- What are other existing assets in the sector?
- Are there assets outside the sector that could be mobilized for community food procurement?
- What are related sectors that might also receive an impact from aggregated procurement (positive or negative)?

## **12. Benefits of the aggregation solution**

Financial resources are limited in the community food sector. Aggregated procurement promises to create a coalition to access and identify best practices in procurement and to make the best possible use of the existing resources. Aggregating procurement can address some of these challenges by providing across the sector access to volume purchasing at a wholesale rather than retail price, or even through unique deals arranged between large producers/ processors and the coalition of agencies.

For many agencies, resources such as space and kitchen infrastructure are also limited. Collaboration may increase shared use of infrastructure at a neighbourhood level. Collaboration can provide some commercial solutions to challenges such as surplus donations of one item (through processing and storage). Shared access to existing menu-planning and nutrition expertise can increase the health outcomes of meal programs. This has been shown to have a positive impact on other measurements as well, including mental health and well-being, learning outcomes and access to employment<sup>17</sup>. Aggregated procurement may also reduce some

---

<sup>17</sup> See Appendix A in Miller 2013 for a range of sources and studies on the full impacts of fresh healthy food for communities; for instance, Story, Mary, M.W. Hamm, D. Wallings. 2009. “Food Systems and Public Health: Linkages to Achieve Healthier Diets and Healthier Communities”. *Journal of Hunger and Environmental Nutrition*. 2009 July; 4(3-4): 219–224. Published online 2009 December 11. doi: [10.1080/19320240903351463](https://doi.org/10.1080/19320240903351463); Union of Concerned Scientists. August 2013. “The \$11 Trillion Reward: How Simple Dietary Changes can Save Lives and Money, and How We Get There”. Online at [http://www.ucsusa.org/food\\_and\\_agriculture/solutions/expand-healthy-food-access/11-trillion-reward.html](http://www.ucsusa.org/food_and_agriculture/solutions/expand-healthy-food-access/11-trillion-reward.html); Van de Weyer, Courtney. 2005. *Changing Diets, Changing Minds: how food affects mental well-being and behavior*. Sustain U.K. Winter 2005.

redundancies such as the delivery of dairy products in more than one delivery to the same agency depending on whether the product was purchased or donated.

Competition among agencies for funding has also created distortions in service delivery. Aggregated procurement creates the foundation for a rationalized approach to fund-raising around shared and overlapping endeavors (like bulk purchasing, access to processed products, and distribution/ deliveries). This is not to say that individual fundraising is not necessary or will not continue, but that some programming (like meal programs) can benefit from partnering for applications for grants and government support. Creating Health Plus offers a model for this, with joint grant applications and aggregated procurement supported by government and charitable sources.

### **13. Other stakeholder perspectives**

The benefits to agencies are described above. Other stakeholders may receive benefits from aggregated procurement as well. For instance, aggregated procurement can provide new markets for local farmers. If the processing capacity includes a mobile cannery, it can be used to process surplus on-farm as well as to offer on-site training and processing at agency sites.

Much of the funding spent on food procurement by social service agencies is either public funding through provincial or federal sources, or from private donors. Because the procurement has been disorganized and reactive, the buyers are not necessarily achieving the best prices or accessing fresh, healthy food. Aggregated procurement allows the sector to organize purchasing to access better food and improve the impact of each food dollar, as well as to improve equitability or pricing and food access across the sector. It can represent a more efficient use of public dollars that also has positive impacts on the local food and agricultural sector.

Aggregated procurement in some instances may also improve the operational capacity of food bank distributors by reducing the need for redundant deliveries (for instance, dairy donations to organizations that have dairy coming from other sources on the same day). If food-based social enterprises that address the needs of the sector (such as commercial processing) are based at kitchens that are under-utilized, this provides a new revenue stream for the host organization

(rent). Finally, as the sector becomes better organized to address supply collaboratively, mainstream distributors may also benefit as agencies seek new wholesale sources of food.

#### Questions for Discussion

- What are other positive impacts of aggregated procurement?
- Are there other parties that might benefit from aggregated procurement?

### **14. Challenges of the aggregation solution**

The greatest barrier to aggregated procurement is probably mobilizing the time and resources from agencies with over-stretched staff and limited food budgets. The online purchasing/ platform model can address this by facilitating exchanges and shared knowledge among the agencies without face-to-face meetings. In addition, because infrastructure is absent across the local food system, organizing the agencies to buy together is not enough; producers and processors also need to organize to be able to access this new group of buyers. Storage, processing and distribution into urban centres is inadequate in the farm sector right now; infrastructure has been focused on production for export rather than for nearby food markets. Even the knowledge for food production for local markets has been lost as farmers leave the profession or focus solely on commodity production.

#### Questions for Discussion

- What are other challenges in developing aggregated procurement in Toronto?
- Are there solutions and trends in storage and distribution available to partner with the project?
- What are opportunities to mitigate the challenges?

### **15. Responding to Challenge**

An important source of new models for local food is the reorganization of the Mennonite communities in southern Ontario around food production after the collapse of the beef industry. In order to stay on the farm, these communities have organized to shift to fresh fruit and

vegetable production, and are rapidly rebuilding the necessary infrastructure<sup>18</sup>. This includes market outlets (numerous well-integrated market stands and farmers’ markets that share food for maximum diversity and exposure), wholesale markets (the new produce auction in Elmira and Lucknow, as well as new mid-scale standard wholesale distributors with warehouse storage and trucking for deliveries). It also includes new processing facilities, mostly geared to production for the market stands but also exploring wider market access (processing jams near Elmira, a new cider mill in Lucknow). Commercial greenhouse operations that extend the season using wood-based boiler systems are in operation as well.

These enterprises in the Mennonite community have been able to develop through community-based investments as well as government support. They demonstrate the possibilities for a province where millions has recently been allocated through the Local Food Fund to rebuild a local food system. The Friends of the Greenbelt Foundation, Metcalf Foundation and McConnell Foundation have also provided important support for rebuilding the food system. In the Holland Marsh, Greenbelt and other funding was mobilized to build a primary processing facility and develop brand marketing.

Aggregated procurement can access funding sources for a number of aspects of the model. The chart below identifies some possibilities (some of which are currently being pursued).

<b>Aggregated Procurement Services</b>	<b>Potential Funding Sources</b>	<b>Possible partners</b>
Centralized ordering for agencies to reduce the time and inefficiency of ordering or shopping at grocery stores	Local Food Fund Ontario Trillium Foundation (for agency coordination) McConnell Foundation	Toronto Public Health, Ontario Food Terminal, FreshTech Charitable partners
Access for agencies to donated food as well as food for purchase	Local Food Fund Growing Forward 2 Atkinson	Toronto Public Health, Ontario Food Terminal, FreshTech, Daily Bread, Second Harvest, North York Harvest, OAFB
Storage for farm surplus in season	Growing Forward 2	Farm sector partners

<sup>18</sup> These comments build on a comprehensive tour of food initiatives in July 2014, as well as a case study in a 2010 report for Sustain Ontario: Miller, S. 2010. *From Land to Plate: The dilemmas and victories of alternative food distribution in Ontario*.

	Anglican Community Development Fund Rural Economic Development program	distributors (FoodShare, etc.) Churches
Processing for farm surplus in season (on-farm or at the centre)	Growing Forward 2 Friends of the Greenbelt Foundation McConnell (value-chain stream) Rural Economic Development program	Farm sector partners Commercial kitchen partner
Aggregated purchasing from suppliers to achieve better pricing for agencies	Atkinson Metcalf	PARC Partner agencies Creating Health Plus committee
Reduction in duplication of deliveries to the same site	Local Food Fund	distributors
Reduction in ordering duplication by agencies	Local Food Fund	distributors
Shared storage for bulk purchases for agencies	Growing Forward 2 Anglican Community Development Fund Mazon	Churches, agency kitchens, distributors
Transparency in pricing for agencies to compare suppliers easily	Local Food Fund	Toronto Public Health, Ontario Food Terminal, FreshTech
Increase in local food flowing to Toronto's agencies	Local Food Fund	Toronto Public Health, Ontario Food Terminal, FreshTech
Increase in access to fresh, healthy food for agencies	Local Food Fund	Toronto Public Health, Ontario Food Terminal, FreshTech
Training and mentoring for high quality food industry jobs	Canada Job Grant TEF (social enterprise) McLean (social enterprise) Alterna Learning Community Grants Lupina (U of T)	George Brown Learning Enrichment Foundation Hospitality Workers Training Centre West End Food Co-op

	Metcalf (Living Economies stream)	
Training and education to increase nutrition levels of meals	Public Health Agency of Canada	Toronto Public Health

#### Questions for Discussion

- What are other possible sources of funding for some aspects of this project?

### **16. Development Framework**

The next step in pursuing the ideas in this discussion paper is consultation among interested parties to address the questions raised here. The Food Flow project is developing some consultation for the Food Flow Kitchen business plan under development. Additional consultation and development is underway with Creating Health Plus and Toronto’s drop in centres.

If an alliance of interested parties is established with appropriate steering committees, then strategic planning, fund-raising and project development can be undertaken based on outcomes from the discussions and consultations.

#### Questions for Discussion

- What are other opportunities for consultation and development?
- Who should be part of the discussions?