

Online Research @ Cardiff

This is an Open Access document downloaded from ORCA, Cardiff University's institutional repository: <https://orca.cardiff.ac.uk/115673/>

This is the author's version of a work that was submitted to / accepted for publication.

Citation for final published version:

Santo, Raychel and Moragues Faus, Ana 2019. Towards a trans-local food governance: Exploring the transformative capacity of food policy assemblages in the US and UK. *Geoforum* 98 , pp. 75-87. 10.1016/j.geoforum.2018.10.002
file

Publishers page: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2018.10.002>
<<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2018.10.002>>

Please note:

Changes made as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing, formatting and page numbers may not be reflected in this version. For the definitive version of this publication, please refer to the published source. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite this paper.

This version is being made available in accordance with publisher policies.

See

<http://orca.cf.ac.uk/policies.html> for usage policies. Copyright and moral rights for publications made available in ORCA are retained by the copyright holders.



1 **Cite as:** Santo, R. and Moragues-Faus, A. (2018) Towards a trans-local food governance: Exploring the
2 transformative capacity of food policy assemblages in the US and UK *Geoforum*

3
4
5
6 **Towards a trans-local food governance: Exploring the transformative capacity of food policy**
7 **assemblages in the US and UK**

8
9
10 **Abstract**

11 A diversity of cross-sectoral, multi-scalar networks are emerging to connect place-based food
12 governance initiatives, such as food policy councils and partnerships, aimed to foster sustainable food
13 security. Yet little research has explored how local food policy groups (LFPGs) are (horizontally)
14 connecting to share knowledge and resources, or interacting (vertically) with other scales of food
15 governance. To address this gap, we examine the trans-local dimension of food policy networks—and its
16 potential to facilitate transformative food system reform. We build on alternative food network, social
17 network, and assemblage thinking to develop an analytical framework that unveils the mobile, unstable,
18 and relational processes and spatialities of LFPGs and the networks which connect them. Through an
19 action-research project comprising a comparative analysis of the Food Policy Networks project in the US
20 and Sustainable Food Cities Network in the UK, we explore how LFPGs connect across different scales
21 and emerge as social-spatial assemblages of food system knowledge, practices, and infrastructure. The
22 findings suggest that conceptualizing these entities as dynamic and place-contingent enables
23 evaluations of their relations and effects to account for features that (could) make them more
24 interconnected, resilient, and transformative, but may also limit their ability to address structurally
25 entrenched food system challenges.

26
27 **1. Introduction**

28
29 A new geography of food policy networks is transforming the food governance landscape. In the
30 last decade, academics and practitioners have devoted increasing attention to how municipalities can

31 foster sustainable food security through holistic and place-based strategies that integrate health,
32 environmental, social, and economic dimensions (Sonnino *et al.*, 2014; Moragues-Faus & Morgan, 2015).
33 Epitomizing local innovations in food system governance are food (policy) councils or partnerships—
34 hereafter local food policy groups (LFPGs), as coined by Halliday (2015)—which have been rapidly
35 emerging across industrialized countries. These groups assemble stakeholders from government, civil
36 society, and the private sector to reform food policy and programs, as well as foster new relationships
37 and interconnections between food system initiatives at municipal and state/provincial, regional, and
38 tribal/First Nations levels.¹ Place-based LFPGs have recently started collaborating in wider alliances, at
39 global (e.g., Milan Food Policy Pact), regional (e.g., EAT Nordic Cities Initiative, African Food Security
40 Urban Network) and national levels, generally aimed at cross-pollinating good practices. These
41 alliances—or trans-local networks of place-based LFPGs—posit new questions around the role of multi-
42 level and multi-site networks in food system governance, such as if and how they may facilitate wide-
43 scale social, environmental, and economic food system reform.

44 To date, researchers have explored the creation, actions, and initial impacts of individual LFPGs
45 (Mendes, 2008; Blay-Palmer, 2009; Santo *et al.*, 2014; Packer, 2014; Coplen & Cuneo, 2015). Others
46 have compared the structures, issues, and activities of multiple LFPGs (Lang *et al.*, 2004; Clancy *et al.*,
47 2007; Schiff, 2008; Scherb *et al.*, 2012; Moragues-Faus & Morgan, 2015; Halliday, 2015; Horst, 2017),
48 although with limited evaluation of their collective impact on changing policy or shifting conventional
49 food governance paradigms (Clark *et al.*, 2015). Scant research exists on how LFPGs connect with one
50 another, why these trans-local networks emerge, or what achievements and challenges these initiatives
51 are experiencing. As Blay-Palmer *et al.* (2016) point out, the increasing diversity of cross-sectoral, multi-

¹ This paper concentrates on LFPGs—which comprise most food policy groups in the UK and 70% in North America; in the latter case, regional (e.g., multi-county, multi-state) (22%), state/provincial (7%), and tribal/First Nations (1%) groups comprise the rest (CLF, 2018).

52 scalar networks arising to facilitate knowledge and resource sharing between local, place-based food
53 initiatives deserves greater academic attention.

54 Furthermore, little comparative research exists on how LFPGs manifest in different countries.
55 Hunt (2015) contrasted the US and UK's national food movements, but excluded municipal reforms.
56 Others have juxtaposed urban food strategies from different countries (Mendes & Sonnino, 2018). Yet,
57 the evolution, governance, and capacities of networks of LFPGs have not been compared across scales
58 and geographies. Given increasing spatial and scalar food governance interdependencies (Moragues-
59 Faus *et al.*, 2017), comparative research may prove useful for exploring how network dynamics evolve in
60 different contexts and their capacity to alter foodscapes at different levels.

61 This research sought to fill these gaps by exploring the emergence and development of trans-
62 local food policy networks through analyzing two national initiatives: the Sustainable Food Cities
63 Network (SFCN) in the UK and Food Policy Networks (FPN) project in the US.² The Johns Hopkins Center
64 for a Livable Future launched FPN in 2013 to build the capacity of new and existing LFPGs that had thus
65 far been mostly isolated³ (Clancy, 2012). Meanwhile, British LFPGs have been spurred by national
66 leadership through SFCN, established in 2011⁴ by a coalition of non-governmental organizations
67 (NGOs)—Soil Association, Sustain, and Food Matters—to help “people and places share challenges,
68 explore practical solutions, and develop best practices” (SFCN, 2016).

69 In comparing these two initiatives, *we aim to progress our understanding on how complex,*
70 *interconnected, dynamic, and geographically dispersed networks constitute new forms of food*
71 *governance and their role in building more sustainable and just food systems.* We first compare three
72 frameworks that have been used to explore networks—social network analysis, actor-network theory,

² Although it surveys Canadian LFPGs, FPN's efforts concentrate on the US and hence this paper focuses on its role there. Food Secure Canada also hosts teleconferences with provincial/territorial food security networks, though its services are limited.

³ After the Community Food Security Network (CFSC) disbanded in 2012, FPN formed to continue its local and state food policy work. While it was FPN's pre-cursor, CFSC had relatively meagre resources and staff for this work.

⁴ SFCN convened its first five members in 2011 but did not begin formalized support until it secured funding in 2013.

73 and assemblage theory. This review highlights how the policy assemblages approach provides an
74 innovative and useful lens to explore the mobile, unstable, and relational processes and spatialities of
75 emergent initiatives like LFGs and their associated trans-local networks. Particular attention is also paid
76 to how these bodies of work conceptualize transformative capacity.

77 The policy assemblage approach allows us to examine the extent to which LFGs and their
78 associated trans-local networks function as emergent and evolving social-spatial assemblages of food
79 system knowledge, practices, and infrastructure. Specifically, we asked: How are LFGs coming together
80 and relating to one another over space and time through the emergence of trans-local networks? How
81 do these trans-local networks shape local food governance ideas, practices, and policies? What
82 transformative capacities do these networks have; could they help scale food system reform *up* from
83 place-based initiatives to regional, national, and international levels and *out* to more municipalities?

84 We explored these questions through a comparative case study analysis of SFCN and FPN. These
85 two national initiatives were selected because they represent the first trans-local networks of LFGs;
86 other networks are only in nascent stages (Figure 1). The multi-method qualitative approach employed
87 included participant observation in network member and advisory group meetings; document analysis
88 of websites, member resources, and listserv emails; and 22 semi-structured interviews carried out with
89 key participants from each network from January-August 2016. Interviewees in each country were
90 selected based on purposive sampling. The first interviews were conducted with network practitioners
91 and advisors, in order to strengthen the research's contextual background and solicit recommendations
92 for additional interviewees. Interview transcripts were thematically coded. Discourse analysis of
93 transcripts, meeting notes, and other documents was then conducted. As an FPN staff member and an
94 SFCN academic partner for over three years each, we developed our project with a participant-action
95 research framework. Such positionalities bolstered our aim to balance academic theory and practice
96 through a praxis useful to the networks we were evaluating (Fuller & Kitchen, 2004; Taylor, 2014).

97 The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section two reviews academic literature on
98 networks in agri-food studies and emerging theories about how to analyze their relations, processes,
99 and effects. We critically discuss social network and policy assemblages literature to develop an
100 analytical framework through which to explore the mobile, dynamic, and relational processes and
101 spatialities of emerging multi-level food policy networks. We then present key characteristics of the
102 SFCN and FPN case studies in section three. Subsequently, these cases are examined through three
103 analytical sections. First, we discuss how the fluid, ever-changing characteristics of LFPGs lend these
104 entities to an exploration as assemblages, and the groups which connect them—SFCN and FPN—as
105 assemblages *of* assemblages. Secondly, we address which factors are stabilizing and destabilizing the
106 collective identities of these assemblages. The final analytical section assesses their capacity for
107 transforming the food system. We conclude by discussing how and with what effect LFPGs in the UK and
108 US are assembling and the usefulness of our analytical approach.

109

110 **2. Researching networks and their transformative capacity: From alternative food networks to policy** 111 **assemblages**

112 Many disciplines engage with networks, whether as *metaphors* to describe the complex,
113 interconnected, and dynamic systems shaping our social and material worlds or as *analytical tools* to
114 study the structures and relations of such systems (Thompson, 2004; Plastrik *et al.*, 2014). In agri-food
115 studies, networks are commonly explored through the lens of alternative food networks (AFNs), a
116 capacious concept developed in the mid-1990s to describe emerging food provisioning efforts (e.g.,
117 farmers markets, community supported agriculture) aimed to (re)connect producers and consumers,
118 (re)spatialize food provenance and quality, and (re)scale food governance processes in ways committed
119 to social justice, ecological sustainability, and economic viability (Kneafsey, 2010). The term network
120 within “AFNs” is used loosely—so much so that others conceptualize the same phenomena as “short

121 food supply chains” or “local/alternative food systems” (Renting *et al.*, 2012). Agri-food scholars have
122 analyzed AFNs through theoretical and methodological lenses related to political economy, rural
123 sociology, and, less commonly, network theories (Tregear, 2011). The latter two incorporate an
124 analytical network approach of some kind, mainly social network analysis and actor-network theory.

125 Within rural sociology, some scholars explore how socially-constructed relations shape material
126 and symbolic notions of quality, trust, place, and locality (Sonnino & Marsden, 2006; Goodman &
127 Goodman, 2009). By employing concepts of strong and weak ties, social capital, and embeddedness,
128 these approaches echo **Social Network Analysis (SNA)**, a positivist sociological methodology that maps
129 and calculates patterns of connectivity between actors. Driven by a functionalist ontology, SNA
130 presumes that a network’s structure determines its actions. Hence analysts seek to understand how
131 varying network properties (e.g., frequency and quantity of interactions, node distribution) yield
132 different outcomes (Borgatti *et al.*, 2009). Central to this literature are the concepts of nodes—people or
133 organizations connected by relationships—and networks, defined as “more flexible, flat and non-
134 hierarchical means of exchange and interaction which promise to be more innovative, responsive and
135 dynamic [than traditional relationships] whilst overcoming spatial separation and providing scale
136 economies” (Henry *et al.*, 2004: 839). The appeal of gathering diverse participants in a flexible manner
137 to diffuse knowledge and experience, leverage efficiencies, and create collective value while
138 decentralizing authority has led to the permeation of network theories to the NGO and “social impact”
139 realm. Networks have been identified as particularly suitable to managing unstructured, cross-cutting,
140 and relentless “wicked problems,” such as the issues that LFPGs address (Weber & Khademanian, 2008).

141 Scholars have problematized some key implications of SNA analyses. Firstly, they neglect
142 systemic power relations and non-human actors (e.g., infrastructure, technologies) within and between
143 networks (Henry *et al.*, 2004; Scott, 2015). Their focus on single-level networks overlooks the multiple
144 intersecting scales of networks that exist in reality (Kapucu *et al.*, 2017). Their cross-sectional depictions

145 of network properties also shroud networks' constantly evolving nature (Kapucu *et al.*, 2017). Finally, by
146 assuming that network actors share values and meanings, such theories obscure the competing interests
147 and discourses inherent in networks' fluid dynamics (Henry *et al.*, 2004).

148 An alternative conception of networks arose from the application of **actor-network theory**
149 **(ANT)**. Beyond human-centered social networks, ANT ascribes agency to non-humans, too, and
150 understands power as a practice derived from the relations between heterogeneous network actants
151 (Latour, 2005) rather than a causal property of an actor's position within a network (Wilkinson, 2005). In
152 agri-food studies, it was envisioned as a way to overcome production/consumption dichotomies by
153 theorizing how these are mutually constitutive (Lockie & Kitto, 2000). It also stimulated thinking about
154 contingency and fluidity (Kneafsey, 2010), offering an innovative approach to topological spatial
155 imaginations that blurred distinctions between proximity and action at a distance (Whatmore & Thorne,
156 1997). For instance, Jarosz (2008: 242) emphasizes that AFNs are "not static objects or sets of
157 relationships," but are constituted out of multiple, contradictory, place-based sociocultural, political,
158 and historical processes and relations. Critics, however, have warned of the potential elusion of socio-
159 economic inequities and political issues under post-structural approaches such as ANT (Moragues-Faus
160 & Marsden, 2017), which may obscure the capacity of initiatives to address the root causes of food
161 insecurity and food system unsustainability.

162 This critical review of two key approaches to study networks within agri-food literature reveals
163 the importance of network structure (highlighted by SNAs) but also of incorporating elements such as
164 fluidity, co-constitution, and place-based contingency in understanding AFNs. Some of these
165 characteristics have been directly linked to the transformative capacity of such initiatives. Moragues-
166 Faus (2017) has proposed to analyze transformative capacity both by acknowledging the place-based
167 contingency and hybridity of radical change (Jarosz, 2008), and by understanding transformative
168 capacity as a relational political process which implies analyzing ethical practices and repertoires as well

169 as the connection of these practices to broader processes of change (Busa & Garder, 2015). Specifically,
170 these political claims of AFNs can be discussed using notions of equity, participation, and inclusion;
171 knowledge and reflexivity; and connectivity and autonomy (Moragues-Faus, 2017).

172 To date, network approaches have been mobilized to study individual AFN initiatives, ignoring
173 their collaborations and connections to wider policy processes (Moragues-Faus and Sonnino, 2012;
174 Levkoe & Wakefield, 2014). This lacuna is significant given the cross-sectoral, multi-scalar networks
175 arising to share knowledge and resources between place-based food initiatives. To fill this gap and
176 overcome aforementioned limitations of network approaches, we turn now to a post-ANT policy
177 assemblages perspective to explore additional analytical tools to investigate how place-based AFNs
178 (specifically LFPGs) collaborate across space and spread their governance ideas.

179

180 2.1 Policy assemblages, mobilities, and mutations

181 To overcome confines of traditional network analyses, geographers and urban studies
182 academics have begun employing **assemblage theory**, which originates from dispersed commentaries by
183 Deleuze (often with Guattari, e.g., Deleuze & Guattari, 1987) on how heterogeneous elements come
184 together to establish emergent, irreducible wholes. Assemblage theory explores the roles that these
185 wholes play as well as the processes through which their components become involved and how such
186 processes stabilize or destabilize their identities. By emphasizing the fluctuating interactions of
187 assemblage parts, one studies “how things work and what they produce” rather than trying to “explain,
188 understand, or interpret what an assemblage ‘is’” (Cumming, 2015: 145; 141). More than a descriptive
189 term, assemblage theory is a style of knowledge production, an approach to exploring and representing
190 the temporality, spatiality, fragility, multiplicity, and potentiality of composite relations and processes
191 (Anderson & McFarlane, 2011).

192 Although sharing many conventions with ANT, assemblage applications (e.g., McFarlane, 2009;
193 Healey, 2013) often assume more structural and human-centered perspectives than ANT/Latoureaux
194 ones (Farías, 2011). This difference arises because, while the Deleuzian approach invites the researcher
195 to diverge from conventional discursive human-centered methods (Coleman & Ringrose 2013;
196 Cumming, 2015), some employ assemblages as a specific type of research object rather than
197 methodological orientation (Brenner *et al.*, 2011; Foroughmand Araabi, 2014).

198 In assemblage thinking, the researcher also assumes a fundamentally spatial analytical
199 foundation which challenges traditional conceptions of scale (McCann & Ward, 2013). Since
200 “assemblages can be component parts of other assemblages,” assemblage theory provides “a unique
201 way of... linking the micro- and macro-levels of social reality...whereby larger entities emerged from the
202 assembly of smaller ones” in a complex web of multiple, overlapping systems at intersecting scales
203 (DeLanda, 2006: 17). McFarlane (2009), for instance, deliberately blurs scalar distinctions between local
204 and global with the term “translocal” to describe interconnected social movements.

205 One relevant application of assemblage theory to studying food policy groups is the “policy
206 assemblage, mobilities, and mutations approach,” which explores “how, why, where and with what
207 effects policies are mobilized, circulated, learned, reformulated and reassembled” (McCann & Ward,
208 2013: 3). This framework differs from conventional ways of understanding and analyzing how
209 governance practices travel and the mechanisms by which we characterize them (i.e. networks). While
210 traditional policy transfer research supposes a linear, rational flow of fixed policy ideas from one place
211 to another, this approach appreciates policymaking as a complex, multilateral process in which ideas are
212 spread and transformed through assemblages, shaped by a matrix of actants from near and far away
213 (Healey, 2013).

214 Policy assemblages, mobilities, and mutations scholars thus differentiate their approach from
215 network and policy transfer ones. McFarlane (2009), for instance, uses “translocal assemblages” instead

216 of “networks” to explore social movements comprised of place-based actors exchanging ideas,
217 knowledge, and resources across sites. He argues that trans-local assemblages are more than just nodes
218 between sites because of the specific histories and labor⁵ required to produce them. Indeed, the
219 transformative capacity of assemblages is linked to their capacity of being innovative and productive,
220 “producing a new reality by making numerous and unexpected connections” (Livesey, 2010: 19).

221 Ultimately, while assemblages share similarities with network conceptions—and some scholars
222 try to employ them concurrently (Levkoe & Wakefield, 2014)—fundamental ontological,
223 epistemological, and methodological divides remain that yield different depictions and analyses of the
224 same “entity.” To address current gaps in the analysis of LFPGs and their networks, we propose in this
225 paper a novel approach in agri-food studies—an analytical framework based on assemblage theory—
226 that offers new modes of engagement and associated capacities for action (Kennedy *et al.*, 2013).
227 Specifically, we explore how and why trans-local food policy assemblages develop, first by characterizing
228 their emergent nature, fluid interactions, and disruption of spatial and scalar divides. Secondly, we
229 unpack the stabilizing and destabilizing forces operating within these assemblages. Finally, we relate
230 these trans-local assemblages’ properties and dynamics to their potential transformative capacity by
231 focusing on the place-based hybridity of change and ethical practice deliberation appreciated in AFN
232 approaches, as well as through assemblage notions of novelty.

233
234 [Figure 1]
235

236 **3. Trans-local food policy networks: The US Food Policy Networks project and UK Sustainable Food** 237 **Cities Network**

⁵ Conventional network descriptions emphasize the “self-organising nature of complex networks and their essential endogenous characters” (Thompson, 2004: 414).

238 Local food policy groups have been emerging in industrialized countries, most frequently in the
239 US (284), UK (55), Canada (52) (Figure 1). Although their organizational structures and relationships with
240 government vary, LFPGs share similar goals of fostering sustainable and just food systems. Many work
241 on changing policy and programs to improve healthy food access, sustainable food procurement, food
242 waste reduction and recovery, agricultural land use, the local food economy, and public food systems
243 knowledge (CLF, 2018; SFCN, 2018). While comparative perspectives can provide valuable insights to
244 places facing similar challenges and potentially reduce duplicative work (or failures), the political and
245 spatial dimensions embedded in local processes must be considered. Thus, we first discuss differences in
246 US and UK political, geographical, and sociocultural contexts influencing LFPGs before elaborating on the
247 organizational characteristics and capacities of the trans-local efforts connecting them.

248

249 3.1 Emergence of local food policy groups in the US and UK

250 The rise and reception of LFPGs have been shaped by the national contexts in which they have
251 arisen. Over the past few decades, national partisan gridlocks and the devolution of powers to localities
252 have prompted municipalities to lead transformative social, economic, and environmental change (Katz &
253 Bradley, 2013). Sheingate (2015) explored this theme in the US by considering how the unravelling
254 federal food/agricultural policy regime—exemplified by the 2014 Farm Bill⁶ debacle—has created space
255 for alternative local food governance innovations. Similar themes have permeated to British society, as
256 one citizen stated, “cities are doing things for themselves because of the vacuum created by the fact that
257 central government isn’t” (Moragues-Faus & Morgan, 2015:1566). The UK and US municipal food
258 movements differ, however, in local governments’ autonomy in policy and programmatic decisions,
259 funding landscapes, and stakeholder participation priorities (Morgan & Santo, 2018).

⁶ The Farm Bill is an omnibus piece of food and agriculture legislation, negotiated every five years, covering food assistance benefits, farm subsidies and loans, conservation, energy, trade, and rural development. The last Farm Bill authorized spending for 2014-2018, and the 2018 reauthorization process is underway.

260 While the devolution of powers to Scotland, Northern Ireland, and Wales and later to English
261 city-regions echoes American devolution narratives, UK local governments have relatively little
262 policymaking authority (Morgan & Sonnino, 2010). New city-region governance structures have been
263 chiefly driven by central government rather than genuine devolution (Kneafsey, 2010). That said, the
264 decentralization of the National Health Services to local authorities has proven instrumental to including
265 a health perspective in UK LFPGs; public health plays a key role in establishing, planning, and delivering
266 local food strategies (King, 2017). The supremacy of London-based central government power must also
267 be considered in context of the UK’s economic, political, and sociocultural “North-South divide,” in which
268 the brunt of large-scale deindustrialization was felt most seriously by Northern England, Wales, Scotland,
269 while post-industrial economic growth disproportionately benefited Southeast England (Baker & Billinge,
270 2004). While regional geographies are complex, fluid, and ambiguous, material disparities exist, and
271 these affect public spatial imaginaries, material conditions, and political realities (*ibid*).

272 Deep geographical divisions in the US also affect local political, economic, and cultural
273 experiences. Partisan preferences vary dramatically between urban, suburban, and rural areas, the
274 former of which have recently swung more politically and socially progressive and the latter of which
275 have bent more politically and socially conservative (Greenblatt, 2014; Parker *et al.*, 2018). The more
276 densely populated East and West Coasts are thus often considered liberal strongholds, along with
277 metropolitan areas in the country’s more central states. As rural areas have lost population, and
278 residents have felt marginalized and economically distressed as a consequence of globalization and
279 federal regulations, a resentment for “disconnected” urban elites has become a common political
280 narrative (Hanson, 2017; Jordan & Sullivan, 2018). With the country’s deep geographical and political
281 polarization—furthered by the 2016 presidential election (Johnston *et al.*, 2017)—inhibiting much
282 consensus at the federal level, the relatively high amount of Constitutionally-granted autonomy that

283 state governments (and in different amounts, local governments) maintain allows for most of the public
284 policy that happens in the country (Moncrief & Squire, 2017).

285 The growth of LFPGs have been financially sustained by different sectors. In the US, while early
286 support came from some federal government programs (Hunt, 2015:192-200), LFPGs are more often
287 funded by (chiefly health-focused) private foundations—the most common funding source after in-kind
288 donations (CLF, 2018). Meanwhile, UK public opinion has traditionally favored a strong welfare state
289 over philanthropy⁷ (Wright, 2001). Most funding for local food systems projects has come from EU rural
290 development grants, government agencies (mostly public health-affiliated), and Lottery funds, though
291 austerity cuts and Brexit threaten these sources (Halliday, 2015; Hunt, 2015), and consequently prompt
292 community and voluntary action as an alternative (Alcock *et al.*, 2012). The presence of foundations to
293 fill in these gaps has been increasing, but they are scarce compared to the US (Daly, 2008; Leat, 2006).
294 Thus, few dedicated food systems funders exist in the UK (Hunt, 2015), with the exception of one
295 national foundation, Esmée Fairbairn, which funded SFCN (and indirectly LFPGs) in 2013 and 2016.

296 US food movement narratives and priorities have also been heavily influenced by literature and
297 activism around structural inequities in the food system (Guel *et al.*, 2016). Despite rhetorical aims to
298 alleviate social injustices, the alternative food movement has been critiqued for re-producing them
299 through its predominantly white, middle-class membership (Guthman, 2008; Alkon & Agyeman, 2011).
300 LFPGs have been implicated in such critiques, thus diverse representation is a common issue many
301 address (McCullagh & Santo, 2014; Day Farnsworth, 2017). In contrast, UK food movement culture does
302 not appreciably emphasize the inclusion or empowerment of people of diverse races, classes, genders,
303 and ages. Little academic literature concentrating on racial and social inequities in the food movement

⁷ Nevertheless, the NGO sector in the UK has progressively been recognized as a plank for economic and social development and currently constitutes a strategic unit to deliver public services and contribute to policy development (Alcock *et al.*, 2012).

304 comes from British authors.⁸ Hunt (2015:178) confirmed this observation in practice, finding in over two
305 decades of comparative analysis that “discussions of social equality were less visible in the English food
306 movement than in the American movement.” Similarly, Halliday (2015:206) noted in her case study of
307 five English LFPGs that the groups were “more focused on [diverse] organizational or professional
308 representation than lay community members” of lower incomes or of color, as in the US. These
309 differences influence how actors within LFPG frame inclusivity and participation, as well as their
310 priorities for food system reform.

311

312 3.2 The rise of trans-local food policy networks

313 Both the US and UK have been pioneers in developing LFPGs. In recent years, national and
314 international networks have also developed to connect these local, place-based initiatives in food
315 governance and policy; FPN and SFCN represent the oldest such examples. As Table 1 demonstrates,
316 they share similar objectives of facilitating peer-to-peer learning, building LFPG capacity, supporting
317 research and evaluation, and potentially enabling collaborative action. However, SFCN devotes more
318 time and resources to hosting national conferences and collective action campaigns, while FPN expends
319 more effort on organizational development for LFPGs. In the following sections, we analyze how these
320 characteristics contribute to the dynamic nature, stabilizing and destabilizing forces, and transformative
321 capacity of LFPGs and their connecting networks.

322

323 [Table 1]

324

325 **4. The dynamic and emergent nature of food policy networks**

326 LFPGs and the trans-local networks connecting them are commonly depicted as a part of a
327 growing phenomenon of organized local/regional entities of food policy actors (see Figure 1). While this

⁸ Goodman (2004:13) and Morgan *et al.* (2007:190) allude to such challenges, but do not focus on them as much US scholarship does.

328 “growth” is compelling, it obfuscates the dynamic composition, temporality, and fluidity of these groups
329 and networks as anticipated by assemblage thinking. Below we further explore the emergent properties
330 of these networks, the types of interactions in which they engage, and their spatial configurations in
331 order to unpack how food policy assemblages develop and connect to one another.

332

333 4.1 Emergence and disappearance of LFPGs

334 Personal experience updating the FPN directory through administering its annual census
335 demonstrated the difficulties of characterizing the “existence” of LFPGs. Firstly, how does one
336 demarcate a group’s formation? When initiators first discuss the idea? When they gather a larger
337 community of stakeholders? When they finalize terms of reference/bylaws? Establishment processes
338 can take several years, making the documentation of LFPGs an ambiguous task. Second, the census
339 counts fluctuate significantly, as LFPGs frequently dissolve and (occasionally) reassemble.⁹ This flux is
340 lost in the appearance of an upward trend, which imparts an impression of an increasing
341 institutionalization or norm of LFPGs but overlooks their internal instability. These dynamics are also
342 rarely discussed in analyses. With few exceptions (Coplen & Cuneo, 2015; Cuy Castellanos *et al.*, 2017),
343 most studies concentrate on success stories. As Jacobs (2012: 419) discusses, “sites of failure, absence
344 and mutation are significant empirical instances of differentiation” and deserve exploration, too. This,
345 however, requires acknowledgment of LFPGs’ unstable and transitory nature.

346 The (non)existence of LFPGs only scratches the surface of their dynamic nature. Even when
347 groups do not officially dissolve, they often undergo significant restructuring. Moreover, LFPGs may
348 have varying “memberships” inherently built into their structure, as an informant states:

349 *“I use ‘network’ loosely. We have a governance group, but no official membership”* (FPN-
350 academic advisor).

⁹ On average, 19 LFPGs were removed from FPN’s directory each year from 2013-17 while 30 entered a period of hiatus or questionable status (e.g., outdated webpage, unresponsive); some re-emerged, as evident by 12 currently active councils that were inactive/dissolved for several years. As of 08/2018, another 120 remain inactive.

351
352 Many LFPGs' memberships consist of an extensive listserv of interested citizens and organizational
353 representatives, a smaller group which attends some meetings, an even smaller group which comes to
354 most meetings and participates in working groups, and sometimes paid staff to organize daily logistics.

355 Some viewed the loose and fluctuating membership of LFPGs as an impediment to influencing
356 policy change or embedding programmatic sustainability. Without an organized structure and consistent
357 membership, LFPGs may struggle to develop long-term relationships internally and externally or to
358 compose an advocacy voice. Others, however, accentuate the flexibility it provides. For instance, LFPGs
359 can adapt their actions to relevant issues for policymakers, funders, or the public. It also builds in
360 resilience to survive changes in political or economic support:

361 *"We kept re-shuffling ourselves... so we could take a hit and be resilient, a big goal after the*
362 *governor took away the [first] council. Then we thought 'we'll get this legislated to live forever'*
363 *and that didn't work. So we said, 'why aren't we thinking about this as less rigid, institutional and*
364 *more living up to what we can in the moment?'" (FPN-academic advisor).*

365 To a lesser extent, the trans-local networks of LFPGs also have a dynamic nature. Although
366 staffed and affiliated within NGO or academic institutions, their governance and organization structures
367 continually evolve, especially as both initiated re-structuring processes in summer 2016. The SFCN's
368 second round of funding radically changed their relationships with member groups (Table 1).
369 Interviewees presumed that by 2019, the network would be self-sufficient by relying further on city
370 resources and developing a distributed leadership.

372 Meanwhile, FPN's creation came as a consequence of the dissolution of another organization,
373 the CFSC (Footnote 3). Since assuming maintenance of CFSC's listserv and resources in 2012, FPN
374 leadership has been exploring how to expand and amplify the support available for LFPGs. The July 2016
375 advisory committee meeting was the first time advisors had met in person to discuss FPN's mission and
376 objectives; accordingly, FPN's long-term role continues evolving.

377 As Table 1 shows, SFCN’s membership is considerably more structured than FPN’s. Groups must
378 apply to become affiliates, which requires LFPGs to demonstrate they have assembled a cross-sector
379 partnership of food system stakeholders to create and implement an action plan that addresses six
380 specific issue areas. In contrast, like many LFPGs, there is no official FPN “membership.” Instead, FPN
381 considers its primary audience the 284 known LFPGs in the US. However, its membership could also be
382 considered its 1,460 listserv subscribers, or even all those who have attended a presentation or training
383 by FPN staff. The indeterminate permanency and varying levels of affiliation and flexibility within the
384 initiatives under study impact their notions of identity and collective capacities.

385
386 [Figure 2]
387
388 4.2 Fluid interactions

389 The relatively delimited official compositions of LFPGs and the networks which connect them
390 (Figure 2) also cloud the complex interactions between these initiatives and others beyond their
391 immediate “memberships.” Understanding their cross-sectoral and cross-scalar interactions is crucial to
392 understanding the role these assemblages play, given that Deleuzian approaches emphasize “what [a
393 body] is capable of, and in what ways its relations with other bodies diminish or enhance those
394 capacities” (Hickey-Moody & Malins, 2007: 3). Informants highlighted how their relations with other
395 organizations and networks influenced their ability to affect change beyond their local situations. Each
396 network they engaged with offered certain attributes, from providing broad frameworks in which to
397 situate their work (e.g., FPN, SFCN) to connecting actors working within similar organizational structures
398 (e.g., Sustainability Directors Network), geographic areas (e.g., Welsh Food and Drink Industry Board),
399 funding constraints (e.g., recipients of certain grants), or topic areas (e.g., UK Food Poverty Alliance,
400 Center for Good Food Purchasing network).

401 These beyond-member relationships were considered fundamental—not just tangential—
402 elements of LFPGs’ work, as these connections bolstered their larger-scale impact. For instance, one

403 interviewee discussed her observation that the network she coordinated was not just a convener of
404 LFPGs in the state, but also a place for other state food-related networks (e.g., Farm-to-School, food
405 hubs, sustainable agriculture networks) to interact:

406 *“Why not take all these other existing networks and use their infrastructure to do what we want*
407 *to do?”* (FPN-academic advisor).

408
409 An SFCN staff person echoed similar sentiments, discussing the importance of engaging beyond the
410 network’s membership:

411 *“[SFCN’s] about finding that common ground with other organizations and networks throughout*
412 *the UK”* (SFCN-staff).

413
414 Interviewees also brought up the importance of not overlooking other unaffiliated actors:

415 *“a lot of people do really good work who aren’t on the council and don’t really relate to it... There*
416 *are formal structures but also all these informal elements supporting it”* (FPN-LFPG1).

417
418 These quotes highlight the suitability of assemblage thinking to understand the large messy webs of
419 interconnected, multiplicitous, and dynamic organizations, networks, and infrastructure in which LFPGs
420 are embedded. Figure 3 attempts to convey this more complicated reality.

421
422 **[Figure 3]**

423
424 4.3 Disrupting spatial divides

425 The diversity of relations established by LFPGs and associated national networks demonstrates
426 how these entities are not confined to single scales or territories, although they are commonly
427 conceived of (e.g., names, jurisdiction boundaries) and analyzed within such confines. In fact, LFPGs may
428 be considered one mechanism through which urban-rural and local-global divides are being blurred. For
429 example, LFPGs in the US are organized within county as well as city institutions, and in the UK campaign
430 for national reforms on issues that affect both urban and rural areas such as food poverty.

431 SFCN and FPN are also instigating new socio-spatial topological relations blurring distinctions
432 between local, regional, national, and global, therefore embodying relational theories of space that

433 transcend conventional scalar imaginaries (Amin, 2004; Massey, 2005). For instance, aided by the
434 national network infrastructure connecting them, LFPGs have begun collaborating on multi-scalar issues.
435 One US LFPG interviewee discussed how she met representatives from a nearby city's LFPG when
436 attending a training hosted by FPN. They have since formed an urban agriculture working group to
437 reform state policies that constrain the work of local urban producers.

438 Meanwhile, SFCN explicitly facilitates annual (opt-in) campaigns for collective action: the first
439 related to shifting seafood procurement, the second to addressing food poverty, the third to reducing
440 sugar consumption, and the fourth to promoting vegetable consumption. Following observations that
441 LFPGs around the country were experiencing similar challenges, SFCN began supporting collaboration to
442 develop and advance a common agenda unlocking municipal and national policy constraints. This aim
443 became particularly relevant in the food poverty campaign. As SFCN staff convened LFPGs on the topic,
444 they realized the need to engage other networks/organizations working on food poverty, which
445 prompted the creation of the UK Food Poverty Alliance. As one informant described:

446 *"...we're all shouting about the same issue, so why not shout together to make a big difference*
447 *instead of us pursuing our little priority and them pursuing theirs?"* (SFCN-staff).

448
449 Following this realization, SFCN developed, in consultation with its members, a food poverty
450 declaration that has been signed by 30 cities. The declaration calls on local and national governments to
451 act on different fronts, including reviewing benefit sanctions and welfare reform implementation and
452 supporting living wages. UK LFPGs have thus assembled with other entities to generate collective
453 capacity to act at different policy levels. Some thought SFCN could do even more:

454 *"[SFCN] could have a bigger voice... can they start getting some pushes with agricultural*
455 *ministers in the devolved nations, other ministers that we should be influencing?"* (SFCN-LFPG1).

456
457 Multi-scalar advocacy and collective action has been pursued less deliberately by FPN, which at
458 this point has not facilitated a specific campaign. It has, however, created resources and shared
459 information on its listserv intended to inspire LFPGs to understand how they relate to—and could

460 potentially impact—federal policies and programs (e.g., Affordable Care Act, Child Nutrition
461 Reauthorization) and international issues (e.g., free trade agreements). Nevertheless, all US LFPGs, when
462 discussing how they thought FPN could be improved, raised what they viewed as an untapped potential
463 for collective action. The imminent 2018 Farm Bill process,¹⁰ in particular, fostered new conversations:

464 *“I want not just talking about how to do local policy, but how does that translate into*
465 *collaborative work on national urban food policy?... [such as] pushing for Farm Bill support for*
466 *urban ag, increased farm to school work, highlighting racial imbalances, access to resources...”*
467 *(FPN-LFPG3).*

468 While LFPG interviewees were eager to discuss potential cross-scalar collaboration, several
469 limitations—in the capacity of the trans-local networks and LFPGs themselves—were also identified.
470 Firstly, trans-local network engagement with processes such as Farm Bill or Brexit discussions requires
471 significant time and resources, especially of network staff, and may have limited returns compared to
472 less politically contentious and cumbersome action at local and regional levels. Second, most LFPGs,
473 with their relatively inexperienced and fluctuating memberships, might be unprepared to work on
474 national or international issues that require long-term commitments and organizational and political
475 sophistication. Third, logistical and organizational realities, such as how government-embedded LFPGs
476 cannot lobby on political issues, could also limit LFPGs’ capacity to engage at higher levels. Fourth, the
477 political process is fundamentally defined by scalar separations of political jurisdictions; obstructing it
478 requires convincing politicians to collaborate beyond their purviews in unprecedented ways. Lastly,
479 nearly all interviewees expressed how their advocacy roles were limited due to struggles in identifying a
480 common, shared platform among LFPG members—let alone among other LFPGs—to advocate for at any
481 level. In sum, the transitory nature and dynamic relations within and beyond LFPGs and SFCN/FPN offer
482 both opportunities for transcending traditional spatial imaginaries, as well as challenges in doing so
483 when constrained by political, economic, and temporal realities.

¹⁰ Since the interviews were conducted in 2016, FPN launched its first attempt to address the Farm Bill through a webinar series beginning in fall 2017.

485

486 **5. Knitting and dissolving assemblages: Stabilizing and destabilizing forces**

487 The section above discussed the convergence of LFPG actors across scales and sites, and
488 highlighted how these assemblages can create productive connections and act as an entity. In this
489 section, we examine which factors stabilize and destabilize these networks in order to understand the
490 different dynamics at play in the creation and re-creation of trans-local food policy assemblages.

491

492 5.1 Stabilizing forces

493 Interviewees emphasized the appeals of participating in LFPGs and SFCN/FPN, including the
494 legitimacy these groups provided to their efforts, reduced feelings of isolation, and capacity to bring
495 diverse voices together to deliberate and identify collective goals. The SFCN and FPN proved important
496 to many interviewees in terms of collective identity benefits. LFPG members valued these trans-local
497 networks for situating their efforts within the larger national context when speaking to decision-makers
498 or the public, and also for overcoming interpersonal political dynamics that LFPGs may face. For FPN
499 members, the annual census (and associated map and chart, e.g., Figure 1) depicting the rise of LFPGs
500 was especially noted:

501 *“This body of work around the country... It’s really helped us gain legitimacy in terms of who we*
502 *are locally and the connections we have beyond our region” (FPN-LFPG2).*

503

504 The SFCN, with its more filtered membership process, comes with an even more distinguished
505 identity than FPN, including common (optional) branding. SFCN interviewees also valued “outsider
506 legitimacy,” noting how its official advocacy campaigns provided credibility for groups attempting to
507 persuade or motivate decentralized health institutions and government to act:

508 *“[SFCN] is giving credibility to [our] partnership...I wouldn’t have gotten anywhere near that level*
509 *of success [on the sustainable fish campaign] if doing it on my own” (SFCN-LFPG1).*

510

511 The differential capacity of SFCN for cross-scalar collective action was also widely acknowledged:

512 *“A lot of work was happening before SFCN set up. But... now you’re part of a bigger picture, can*
513 *speak with a bigger voice...”* (SFCN-practitioner advisor).

514
515 Along this line, the SFCN award works as an ordering device to evaluate and celebrate food

516 policy activity across the UK under a common framework. The SFCN confers three tiers of awards
517 (bronze, silver, gold) to celebrate progress of LFPGs on various health and sustainability issues. A few
518 LFPG interviewees discussed how they valued the award process for credibility reasons:

519 *“I’m not a big fan of awards... feels a wee bit superficial. However, at the Liverpool conference*
520 *this year, I saw the awards given out to the three cities. Belfast had brought along a deputy*
521 *leader. And I noticed the... quite good PR around [Bristol’s] award. So I see advantages at a*
522 *political level to get these awards.”* (SFCN-LFPG2)

523
524 Others valued the opportunities the SFCN award process provided for LFPG members to more closely
525 identify as a local group and gain motivation to advance a common agenda:

526 *“Doing the work towards getting the Bronze Award really brought the partnership together...*
527 *People had to tell me what they were doing and... perhaps work together.”* (SFCN-LFPG1).

528
529 Thus, the FPN census and SFCN branding, national campaigns, and award system all represent
530 synthesizing tools that help LFPGs, as components of the larger FPN/SFCN assemblages, express their
531 common identity to pursue collective goals.

532

533 5.2 Destabilizing forces

534 The momentary and long-term collective identity of these groups is *“not neat and tidy as it*
535 *sounds,”* as one interviewee explained (FPN-LFPG2). Numerous debates exist both within LFPGs and the
536 trans-local networks connecting them over how to characterize their fundamental purpose—and hence
537 how to name them and which issues to address—and how to go about resolving these contentions.
538 These issues could be considered destabilizing forces, given their potential to divide members and
539 undermine LFPGs’ potential progress.

540 For many LFPGs, fundamental questions have surfaced around establishing objectives. For
541 instance, interviewees discussed how most LFPGs have pursued low-hanging fruits, *“feel-good things”*

542 (FPN-LFGP1) like farmers markets and healthy eating initiatives instead of more contentious, but also
543 perhaps more transformative food system issues such as land ownership reform, labor rights,
544 commodity subsidies, dietary recommendations, or Brexit. Practitioners expressed concerns about how
545 collective values and decision-making processes within and between LFPGs have not been determined.

546 One coordinator discussed such dilemmas since the recent proliferation of LFPGs in her state:

547 *“We’re all councils built around this model, but we don’t actually know that we’re in concert on*
548 *particular issues. We don’t have a shared platform that we’re working on locally, then*
549 *advocating for at the state level. That’s where I see potential... but that could be potentially*
550 *contentious, too. Our state has a local food and farm task force. And they’re like, ‘this local food,*
551 *healthy eating stuff is nice, but don’t mess with big ag’... There’s this impetus to network, but*
552 *maybe without the harder discussions of the actual worldview or end goal. But maybe the*
553 *council is about creating a space for those conversations” (FPN-LFPG1).*

554
555 Another coordinator echoed similar thoughts when describing how the LFPG, as a loose association of
556 interested people/organizations, has limited ability to engage with contentious but essential topics:

557 *“We’ve been just synching up our work... but how do we actually take a position on something?...*
558 *We updated the urban ag zoning code, a real success. [But] that’s non-controversial... [When]*
559 *there was paid sick leave legislation in the city, it was difficult because we count amongst our*
560 *membership some restaurants that were opposing the bill. With no clear decision-making*
561 *structure, we weren’t able to make any advance beyond education, information sharing” (FPN-*
562 *LFPG2).*

563
564 The competing discourses amongst LFPG members regarding what problems they seek to
565 address and how to address them underscore more fundamental issues among LFPGs: what is their
566 actual purpose or their strategy to transform food systems? Different answers entail different actions
567 and member compositions. For instance, debate exists over what constitutes a diversity of stakeholders.
568 Some view it as a cross-sectoral array of organizational representatives and decision-makers (“grass-
569 tops”), whereas others emphasize grassroots community engagement. Some aim to connect
570 local/sustainable food advocates with congruent underlying values, while others urge the inclusion of
571 “conventional” stakeholders to achieve more widespread (though maybe less progressive) change. The
572 radical versus reformist potential of LFPGs has been debated for years (Holt-Giménez & Wang, 2011;

573 Packer, 2014), but these opposing approaches create divisions within LFPGs and within the trans-local
574 networks connecting them, threatening their cohesiveness and capacity for collective action.

575 Such contestations were particularly notable in US LFPGs and FPN. Some LFPGs emphasized that
576 their focus was on engaging the community members most impacted by food poverty and lack of access
577 to healthy food—mostly lower-income residents and people of color. This often meant changing the
578 name and nature of the LFPG, shifting from policy to more educational and programmatic initiatives:

579 *“FPN and other [LFPGs]...are so wedded to saying it’s food policy when the average person’s...
580 super turned-off by that terminology...when [the former LFPG leadership] were doing ‘food policy
581 listening sessions,’ they had a self-selected group of rich white people. But when I do ‘Food
582 Turnup’ events, I get lots of different people...”* (FPN-practitioner advisor).

583
584 In one conservative Midwestern state, diverse inclusion meant engaging with not just small
585 organic producers but also conventional ones who comprise most nearby producers. This steered the
586 LFPG towards less contentious efforts. It also compelled them to frame themselves differently:

587 *“there’s a lot of food policy councils here, but most of them are ‘food and farm coalitions’
588 because policy is a bad word in most of [this state]”* (FPN-LFPG1).

589
590 In contrast, FPN staff thought that a key purpose of LFPGs (and FPN supporting them) was explicitly to
591 help the public better understand and engage in policy and governance processes:

592 *“Do people understand how their government works? Do they know how to find out who to talk
593 to in a particular department to get issues worked out? It’s not a legislative act in most cases... a
594 big part of [FPN’s] role is educating people about the process”* (FPN-staff).

595
596 Other members of the FPN advisory committee somewhat eschewed community engagement
597 and civic education altogether, given that more progress could be achieved (and more quickly) to
598 improve food security and sustainability outcomes by coordinating a few “grass-tops” individuals. FPN
599 leadership disagreements about the inherent purpose of LFPGs fed into larger questions at the advisory
600 meeting—and echoed by LFPG members—about the fundamental purpose of FPN itself. Informants
601 pondered the extent to which FPN was for information sharing, mentoring, and capacity building of
602 individual LFPGs, or for collective action at national or international levels.

603 Debates over the inherent purposes of LFPGs, and the networks supporting them, did not
604 appear to be as concerning to SFCN affiliates. As one interviewee described, most UK LFPGs are called
605 food partnerships because local authorities do not have as many policy powers as their US counterparts.
606 It could also partly be due to the fact that SFCN's established issue areas and application direct groups
607 towards having similar foci and membership compositions.

608 Ultimately, LFPGs are far from homogeneous. On the one hand, LFPG's different names,
609 terminologies, and objectives demonstrated the modifications occurring as these new food governance
610 practices and policies travel to places with specific socio-cultural norms and political realities. On the
611 other hand, they raised underlying doubts about whether LFPGs within individual countries and
612 between the UK and US can even be categorized as part of the same phenomenon:

613 *"They are very different. [LFPGs] in America and Canada do some of what food partnerships do*
614 *here... but it's largely dependent on what and how the structure is set up, what level of funding it*
615 *has, how it's integrated into the local authority"* (SFCN-practitioner advisor).
616

617 Fundamental questions remain about whether LFPGs and the networks connecting them share similar
618 enough purposes to identify as part of the same movement, within and across countries. Different forms
619 of organizational infrastructure may be needed if they aim to scale up their policy action.

620

621 **6. Analyzing the transformative capacity of trans-local assemblages**

622 The sections above highlighted the hybridity of LFPGs and their networks, revealing their distinct
623 alignment with alternative but also conventional food groups. These characteristics elicit questions
624 around their effectiveness for structural reform. We will now assess the potential transformative
625 capacity of trans-local networks of LFPGs from the place-based hybridity of change and ethical practice
626 deliberation appreciated in AFN approaches, as well as through assemblage notions of novelty.

627 Following AFNs' conceptualization of transformative capacity, we are witnessing how LFPGs are
628 supporting place-based transitions to sustainable food systems through more participative and inclusive

629 forms of food governance. Of particular importance is the social, physical, and digital infrastructure that
630 supports trans-local food movements by creating avenues for cities to connect and share place-based
631 knowledge. Facilitators of both networks emphasized how such infrastructure helps cities interact with
632 peers, and helps to sustain the networks long-term. As one SFCN staff member explained:

633 *“You can formally construct opportunities [like conferences]... but that is resource intense. You*
634 *really want some kind of spontaneous connecting between cities themselves”* (SFCN-staff).

635
636 The networks have also been critical components in the spread of LFPGs to new municipalities.

637 Nearly all informants mentioned how they had attended a training session facilitated by SFCN or FPN
638 staff, which provided necessary support, and sometimes the impetus, to launch their LFPG:

639 *“We would never have done it if it wasn’t for [SFCN]”* (SFCN-LFPG4).

640 This analysis of food policy groups revealed current gaps in how ethical repertoires are
641 constructed—a key aspect to understanding these initiatives’ transformative capacities—particularly
642 around notions of *connectivity* (e.g., defining purpose, public framing) and *diversity* when working across
643 sectors, interests, and scales. On the one hand, LFPGs, and particularly their national umbrella networks,
644 are actively engaging with broader processes of social change. These relational political processes have
645 been particularly notable in how SFCN and FPN have begun to influence the narratives of decision-
646 makers and, in an inchoate way, funders. By demonstrating and supporting the spread of LFPGs, they
647 have helped normalize the integration of food into municipal governments’ agendas:

648 *“[SFCN’s] creating a food path in municipal politics... there was no mandate, no tradition of*
649 *talking about food... by making food visible, it allows us to view and value it in different ways.*
650 *That’s why it’s one of, if not the most, important innovation in the UK sustainable food*
651 *movement in the last 20 years”* (SFCN-academic advisor).

652
653 Since funding was universally described as a core difficulty for LFPGs, some emphasized that FPN
654 and SFCN could play a larger role in shaping funder priorities to amplify and expand the work of LFPGs.
655 For instance, FPN could influence how funders distribute resources, given that many food system
656 problems stem from inequitable resource allocation:

657 *“A lot [of foundation money] goes through... white-led organizations who hand out resources to*
658 *people of color, or work in communities of color... [FPN should] call [foundations] out as a more*
659 *neutral national-level organization for the burden to be on” (FPN-LFPG3).*
660

661 On the other hand, FPN and SFCN are also prompting reflexivity in local food governance
662 practices. For example, interviewees in both countries discussed the predominance of funding for LFPGs
663 from the public health sector. While this demonstrates LFPGs’ flexibility to adapt to current political and
664 funding climates, it could be narrowing their scope of work:

665 *“A substantial part [of the food movement] was focused on the environment, sustainable ag,*
666 *farmers and workers. In the last census [of LFPGs], you don’t see [anyone addressing] those*
667 *issues...we’ve shifted to healthy food access. The attention to chronic disease, obesity’s a double-*
668 *edged sword... this shift toward where the funding’s coming from...I’d ask, are we [FPN] taking a*
669 *systems perspective as a network?” (FPN-academic advisor).*
670

671 Another example comes from discussions about the demographic composition of LFPGs.
672 Observations of SFCN listserv discussions, online resources, and meetings suggested that the priority of
673 engaging community members from diverse classes and races was off the radar. Compared to the US,
674 where every single interviewee brought up the issue of meaningful community engagement, diversity (if
675 mentioned) in UK LFPGs entailed achieving diverse sectoral representation (a requirement to join SFCN).
676 Led by experienced NGOs, SFCN has successfully institutionalized the importance of cross-sectoral
677 partnerships and collaborative development of local food policies, but has not emphasized the larger
678 social and racial justice themes prominent in US narratives. By revealing these trends, the trans-local
679 networks can play a role in fostering more holistic outlooks in LFPGs’ policy and programmatic priorities.

680 That said, the level of *connectivity* with actors addressing structural causes of food insecurity
681 and inequity, and the inclusion of *diverse* voices, varies greatly among LFPGs and remains untapped by
682 the national assemblages. For example, some interviewees pointed out how FPN trainings cater to
683 white, middle class norms, threatening its ability to effectively support LFPG members from different
684 sociocultural and political backgrounds.

685 These disparities also have a spatial dimension. In the US, informants discussed the low amount
686 of resources, trainings, and technical assistance for LFPGs outside of the East and West Coasts and a few
687 Midwest states, reproducing the wider political economy of the country. Many mentioned how most
688 LFPG work has focused on urban areas, thus rural areas might not see the relevance of creating LFPGs or
689 have as many resources to do so.

690 In the UK, regional geographical differences between the North and South predominated
691 concerns about how SFCN may disproportionately cater its resources. One interviewee discussed how
692 SFCN's broad membership enticed its political leadership to join:

693 *"[Our] Council really likes that other [SFCN flagship cities] are gritty Northern, ex-industrial towns*
694 *like Liverpool and Newcastle. If the other cities had all been Bristols, Baths, and Brightons, it*
695 *wouldn't have been all that excited about the network"* (SFCN-LFPG3).

696 Nevertheless, while SFCN membership includes LFPGs from different regions and political and
697 economic contexts (it intentionally funded flagship cities outside of Southern England), it notably has
698 conferred SFCN awards to almost all¹¹ Southern English cities. Some attendees at SFCN's 2016
699 conference expressed frustration that Northern LFPGs, who face more barriers to integrated food
700 system reform and are working from different baselines of citizen interest and resources, were not
701 recognized, nor were the "best practices" awarded relevant to their contexts.

702 Informants also raised topics that they thought were critical to achieving transformative food
703 system reform but were missing from FPN and SFCN narratives and resources, including food worker
704 labor relations, engagement with businesses, dietary shifts (e.g., away from red meat), and non-food
705 issues underlying food ones. For instance, as one LFPG coordinator described:

706 *"Everyone thinks about subsidies, food deserts, food stamps, school lunch but where local*
707 *governments exert their influence is longer-term, more systems-shifting stuff. Like public finance,*
708 *structures around bonding and development incentives, land preservation, land acquisition for*
709 *beginning farmers, maybe even affordable housing... because it's easier to skip a few meals than*
710 *a housing or rental payment. That issue-bridging in more substantial ways would be really*
711 *helpful."* (FPN-LFPG1)
712

¹¹ The only exceptions to the nine awards given in 2015-6 were Cardiff and Belfast.

713
714 Thus, while the trans-local networks are stimulating relational political processes around connectivity
715 and diversity, further and deeper opportunities to advance social change remain.

716 An assemblage conceptualization of transformative capacity, which avoids the normative tone
717 of AFN literature, provides another perspective by highlighting how LFPGs are constantly generating
718 new connections, activities, infrastructure, and knowledge with a high capacity to recombine these in
719 different ways, and by downplaying whether this flexibility elicits disappearance relatively quickly. Their
720 dynamic nature and malleability of issues addressed allow LFPGs to build alliances and navigate political
721 and economic changes. However, they may also restrict groups' abilities to institutionalize or advocate
722 for change at higher levels. The assemblage perspective of transformative capacity unveils that SFCN
723 and FPN capitalize in this nebula of activity to pursue collective goals and push for wider food system
724 reform while simultaneously reinforcing place-based actions and spreading good practices.

725 Nevertheless, if one considers the purpose of LFPGs and the networks connecting them to be
726 addressing the most fundamental food system issues—e.g., inequities in trade and distribution,
727 socioeconomic and racial injustices, unsustainable diets—such capacities currently remain limited. This
728 underscores a larger critique about the relevance of the assemblage approach: it provides a useful lens
729 for characterizing the nature of these groups, but does not provide a framework for how to counteract
730 structurally entrenched forces with unstable and transient assemblages without clear agendas or
731 membership structures.

732 733 **7. Conclusion**

734 This research informs discussions around the potential of *scaling up* municipal food policy and
735 governance reforms to regional and national levels through trans-local solidarity. Scholars have
736 suggested such collaborative action could be valuable, given that many municipal food system decisions
737 are constrained by higher-level policies (Clancy, 2012; 2014). Moreover, since many cities face similar

738 food system issues, they may benefit from sharing ways to address them, especially if accelerated
739 transformation occurs by *scaling* municipal innovations *out* to cities that have not yet entered the food
740 planning realm. Instead of prescribing a template of food system reforms, Blay-Palmer *et al.* (2016: 31)
741 have proposed developing a “suite of good practice options for communities [that] allows each
742 community to select and develop their unique place-appropriate good practices and build knowledge-
743 sharing networks at the same time.”

744 Following trans-local policy assemblage literature and current conceptualizations of
745 transformative capacity, our analysis of SFCN and FPN demonstrates that municipal food governance
746 ideas and practices are indeed not simply traveling from one place to the next unchanged, exemplified
747 not only by the variety of lexicons adopted by LFPGs, but more fundamentally by their diverse
748 structures, member compositions, funding sources, and activities. Some of these differences stem from
749 specific political, geographical, and sociocultural contexts, revealing key distinctions between the two
750 countries analyzed, such as the ability to institutionalize changes across scales and geographies. These
751 situated contingencies indicate that municipalities may be employing a toolbox approach to place-based
752 food reform, however they may also limit the ability of such assemblages to synthesize an identity
753 strong enough to advance collective action at higher levels. Inequities in the allocation of support and
754 resources may also limit the cohesiveness and effectiveness of the networks connecting them.

755 Comparing these networks has provided practical insights in how to cross-pollinate knowledge,
756 good practices, and capacity-building between both SFCN and FPN, which may improve their processes
757 and outcomes. It may also inform the efforts of trans-local food policy networks emerging at other
758 scales (e.g., Milan Urban Food Policy Pact, CITYFOOD), and in other places (e.g., Germany, Netherlands,
759 Scandinavia, Spain). However, this research also posits a key question to the academic and food policy
760 community. What types of governance structures can reconcile flexible, place-based, and inclusive food
761 system reform while tackling the structural causes of an unsustainable and unjust food system? It is

762 paramount to further explore what types of tools and agencies might build on and effectively bridge the
763 gap between different practical and theoretical approaches to food system transformation.

764

765 **References**

766

767 Alcock, P., Kendall, J., Parry, J., 2012. From the third sector to the Big Society: Consensus or contention
768 in the 2010 UK General Election? *Voluntary Sector Review* 3, 347–363.

769 <https://doi.org/10.1332/204080512X658054>

770

771 Alkon, A.H., Agyeman, J. (Eds.), 2011. *Cultivating food justice: Race, class, and sustainability*. MIT Press,
772 Cambridge.

773

774 Amin, A., 2004. Regions unbound: Towards a new politics of place. *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human*
775 *Geography* 86 (1), 33-44. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0435-3684.2004.00152.x>

776

777 Anderson, B., McFarlane, C., 2011. Assemblage and geography. *Area* 43 (2), 124-127.

778 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-4762.2011.01004.x>

779

780 Baker, A.R., Billinge, M. (Eds.), 2004. *Geographies of England: The North-South divide, material and*
781 *imagined* (Volume 37). Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

782

783 Blay-Palmer, A., Sonnino, R., Custot, J., 2016. A food politics of the possible? Growing sustainable food
784 systems through networks of knowledge. *Agriculture and Human Values* 33 (1), 27-43.

785 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10460-015-9592-0>

786

787 Blay-Palmer, A., 2009. The Canadian pioneer: The genesis of urban food policy in Toronto. *International*
788 *Planning Studies* 14 (4), 401-416. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13563471003642837>

789

790 Borgatti, S.P., Mehra, A., Brass, D.J., Labianca, G., 2009. Network analysis in the social sciences. *Science*
791 323 (5916), 892-895. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.324_465c

792

793 Brenner, N., Madden, D.J., Wachsmuth, D., 2011. Assemblage urbanism and the challenges of critical
794 urban theory. *City* 15 (2), 225-240. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13604813.2011.568717>

795

796 Busa, J.H., Garder, R., 2015. Champions of the movement or fair-weather heroes? Individualization and
797 the (a)politics of local food. *Antipode* 47 (2), 323–341. <https://doi.org/10.1111/anti.12108>

798

799 Johns Hopkins Center for a Livable Future (CLF), 2018. Food policy council directory [Data file and
800 personal communication]. Accessed 8 August 2018.

801

802 Cuy Castellanos, D., Jones, J.C., Christaldi, J., Liutkus, K.A., 2017. Perspectives on the development of a
803 local food system: The case of Dayton, Ohio. *Agroecology and Sustainable Food Systems* 41 (2), 186-203.

804 <https://doi.org/10.1080/21683565.2016.1263893>

805

806 Clancy, K., 2014. Food system governance. *Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems, and Community*
807 *Development* 4 (2), 3–6. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5304/jafscd.2014.042.012>

808

809 Clancy, K., 2012. Issues of scale. *Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems, and Community Development* 3
810 (1), 21–23. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5304/jafscd.2012.031.017>

811

812 Clancy, K., Hammer, J., Lippoldt, D., 2007. Food Policy Councils: Past, present and future. In: Hinrichs,

813 C.C., Lyson, T.A. (Eds.) *Remaking the North American Food System: Strategies for Sustainability*.
814 University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln, pp.121-143.
815

816 Clark, J.K., Sharp, J.S., Dugan, K.L., 2015. The agrifood system policy agenda and research
817 domain. *Journal of Rural Studies* 42, 112-122. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2015.10.004>
818

819 Coleman, R., Ringrose, J. (Eds.), 2013. *Deleuze and Research Methodologies*. Edinburgh University Press,
820 Edinburgh.
821

822 Coplen, A.K., Cuneo, M., 2015. Dissolved: Lessons learned from the Portland Multnomah Food Policy
823 Council. *Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems, and Community Development* 15, 91-107.
824 <http://dx.doi.org/10.5304/jafscd.2015.052.002>
825

826 Cumming, T., 2015. Challenges of 'thinking differently' with rhizoanalytic approaches: A reflexive
827 account. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education* 38 (2), 137-148.
828 <https://doi.org/10.1080/1743727X.2014.896892>
829

830 Daly, S., 2008. Institutional innovation in philanthropy: Community foundations in the UK. *Voluntas:*
831 *International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 19(3), 219-241.
832

833 Day Farnsworth, L., 2017. Beyond policy: Race, class, leadership, and agenda-setting on North American
834 food policy councils. In: Etmanski, C. (Ed.) *Food Leadership: Leadership and Adult Learning for Global*
835 *Food Systems Transformation*. Sense Publishers, Rotterdam.
836

837 DeLanda, M., 2006. *A New Philosophy of Society: Assemblage Theory and Social Complexity*. Continuum,
838 London.
839

840 Deleuze, G., Guattari, F., 1987. *A Thousand Plateaus*. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.
841

842 Farías, I., Bender, T. (Eds.), 2012. *Urban Assemblages: How Actor-Network Theory Changes Urban*
843 *Studies*. Routledge, Oxford.
844

845 Foroughmand Araabi, H., 2014. Deleuze and research methodologies: The impact on planning.
846 *City* 18(4-5), 589-593. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13604813.2014.939508>
847

848 Fuller, D., Kitchin, R. (Eds.), 2004. *Radical Theory/Critical Praxis: Making a Difference Beyond the*
849 *Academy*. (e)Press, Victoria. http://www.praxis-epress.org/rtcp/RTCP_Whole.pdf
850

851 Goodman, D., Goodman, M., 2009. Alternative food networks. *International Encyclopedia of Human*
852 *Geography* 3, 208-220.
853

854 Goodman, D., 2004. Rural Europe redux? Reflections on alternative agro-food networks and paradigm
855 change. *Sociologia ruralis*, 44(1), 3-16.
856

857 Greenblatt, A., 2014. Rural areas lose people but not power. *Governing* (April).
858

859 Guel, A., Pirog, R., Wimbaugh, T., 2016. *An Annotated Bibliography on Structural Racism Present in the*
860 *U.S. Food System* (Third edition). MSU Center for Regional Food Systems, East Lansing.

861
862 Guthman, J., 2008. "If they only knew": Color blindness and universalism in California alternative food
863 institutions. *The Professional Geographer* 60 (3), 387-397. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00330120802013679>
864
865 Halliday, J.J., 2015. *A New Institutional Analysis of Local Level Food Policy in England between 2012*
866 *and 2014* (Doctoral dissertation, City University London).
867
868 Hanson, V.D., 2017. Trump and the American Divide. *City Journal* (Winter).
869
870 Healey, P., 2013. Circuits of knowledge and techniques: The transnational flow of planning ideas and
871 practices. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 37(5), 1510-26.
872 <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2427.12044>
873
874 Henry, L., Mohan, G., Yanacopulos, H., 2004. Networks as transnational agents of development. *Third*
875 *World Quarterly* 25(5), 839–855. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0143659042000231983>
876
877 Hickey-Moody, A., Malins, P., 2007. *Deleuzian Encounters: Studies in Contemporary Social Issues*.
878 Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke.
879
880 Holt-Giménez, E., Wang, Y., 2011. Reform or transformation? The pivotal role of food justice in the U.S.
881 food movement. *Race/Ethnicity: Multidisciplinary Global Contexts* 5 (1), 83-102.
882 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2979/racethmulglocon.5.1.83>
883
884 Horst, M., 2017. Food justice and municipal government in the USA. *Planning Theory & Practice* 18 (1),
885 51-70. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649357.2016.1270351>
886
887 Hunt, A.R., 2015. *Civic Engagement in Food System Governance: A Comparative Perspective of American*
888 *and British Local Food Movements*. Routledge, Oxford.
889
890 Jacobs, J., 2012. Urban geographies I: Still thinking cities relationally. *Progress in Human Geography* 36
891 (3), 412-422. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132511421715>
892
893 Jarosz, L., 2008. The city in the country: Growing alternative food networks in Metropolitan areas.
894 *Journal of Rural Studies* 24 (3), 231-244. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2007.10.002>
895
896 Johnston, R., Pattie, C., Jones, K., Manley, D., 2017. Was the 2016 United States' presidential contest a
897 deviating election? Continuity and change in the electoral map—or "Plus ça change, plus ç'est la même
898 géographie." *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion and Parties* 27(4), 369-388.
899
900 Jordan, M., Sullivan, K., 2018. 'Smothered' and 'shoved aside' in rural America. *Washington Post*
901 (January 1).
902
903 Kapucu, N., Hu, Q., Khosa, S., 2014. The state of network research in public administration.
904 *Administration & Society* 49 (8), 1087–1120. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0095399714555752>
905
906 Katz, B., Bradley, J., 2013. *The Metropolitan Revolution: How Cities and Metros are Fixing our Broken*
907 *Politics and Fragile Economy*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.
908

909 Kennedy, R., Zapasnik, J., McCann, H., Bruce, M., 2013. All those little machines: Assemblage as
910 transformative theory. *Australian Humanities Review* 55, 45–66.
911

912 King, S., 2017. Making the case for a place-based systems approach to healthy and sustainable food:
913 Public health professionals' assessment of Sustainable Food Cities. University of the West of England,
914 Bristol.
915 [http://sustainablefoodcities.org/Portals/4/Documents/Full_Report_Making%20the%20case%20for%20a](http://sustainablefoodcities.org/Portals/4/Documents/Full_Report_Making%20the%20case%20for%20a%20place%20based%20systems%20approach%20to%20healthy%20and%20sustainable%20food.pdf)
916 [%20place%20based%20systems%20approach%20to%20healthy%20and%20sustainable%20food.pdf](http://sustainablefoodcities.org/Portals/4/Documents/Full_Report_Making%20the%20case%20for%20a%20place%20based%20systems%20approach%20to%20healthy%20and%20sustainable%20food.pdf)
917 [Accessed 16 August 2018].
918

919 Kneafsey, M., 2010. The region in food—important or irrelevant? *Cambridge Journal of Regions,*
920 *Economy and Society* 3, 177-190. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cjres/rsq012>
921

922 Lang, T., Rayner, G., Rayner, M., Barling, D., Millstone, E., 2004. Discussion paper: Policy Councils on
923 food, nutrition and physical activity: The UK as a case study. *Public Health Nutrition* 8 (1), 11-19.
924 <https://doi.org/10.1079/PHN2004654>
925

926 Latour, B., 2005. *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network Theory*. Oxford University
927 Press, Oxford.
928

929 Leat, D., 2006. Foundation legitimacy at the community level in the United Kingdom. In Toepler, S.
930 (ed.), *Legitimacy of Philanthropic Foundations: United States and European Perspectives*. Russell Sage
931 Foundation, 252-270.
932

933 Levkoe, C.Z., Wakefield, S., 2014. Understanding contemporary networks of environmental and social
934 change: Complex assemblages within Canada's 'food movement.' *Environmental Politics* 23 (2), 302-320.
935 <https://doi.org/10.1080/09644016.2013.818302>
936

937 Livesey, G., 2010. Assemblage. In: Parr, A. (Ed.) *The Deleuze Dictionary* (2nd ed.). Edinburgh UP,
938 Edinburgh, pp. 18–9.
939

940 Lockie, S., Kitto, S., 2000. Beyond the farm gate: Production-consumption networks and agri-food
941 research. *Sociologia Ruralis* 40 (1), 3–19. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9523.00128>
942

943 Massey, D., 2005. *For Space*. SAGE, London.
944

945 McCann, E., Ward, K., 2013. A multi-disciplinary approach to policy transfer research: Geographies,
946 assemblages, mobilities and mutations. *Policy Studies* 34 (1), 2-18.
947 <https://doi.org/10.1080/01442872.2012.748563>
948

949 McCullagh, M., Santo, R. (Eds.), 2014. *Food Policy for All: Inclusion of Diverse Community on Food Policy*
950 *Councils*. Center for a Livable Future, Baltimore.
951

952 McFarlane, C., 2009. Translocal assemblages: Space, power and social movements. *Geoforum* 40 (4),
953 561-567. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2009.05.003>
954

955 Mendes, W., Sonnino, R., 2018. Urban food governance in the Global North. In: Marsden, T. (Ed.)
956 *Handbook of Nature*. Sage, London.

957
958 Mendes, W., 2008. Implementing social and environmental policies in cities: The case of food policy in
959 Vancouver, Canada. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 32 (4), 942-67.
960 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2427.2008.00814.x>
961
962 Moncrief, G.F. and Squire, P., 2017. *Why states matter: An introduction to state politics*. Rowman &
963 Littlefield.
964
965 Moragues-Faus, A., Marsden, T., 2017. The political ecology of food: Carving 'spaces of possibility' in a
966 new research agenda. *Journal of Rural Studies* 55, 275-288.
967 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2017.08.016>
968
969 Moragues Faus, A., Sonnino, R., Marsden, T.K., 2017. Exploring European food system vulnerabilities:
970 Towards integrated food security governance. *Environmental Science and Policy* 75, 184-215.
971 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2017.05.015>
972
973 Moragues-Faus, A., 2017. Emancipatory or neoliberal food politics? Exploring the "politics of collectivity"
974 of buying groups in the search for egalitarian food democracies. *Antipode* 49 (2), 455-476.
975 <https://doi.org/10.1111/anti.12274>
976
977 Moragues-Faus, A., Morgan, K., 2015. Reframing the foodscape: The emergent world of urban food
978 policy. *Environment and Planning A* 47 (7), 1558-1573. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0308518X15595754>
979
980 Moragues-Faus, A., Sonnino, R., 2012. Embedding Quality in the Agro-food System: The Dynamics and
981 Implications of Place-Making Strategies in the Olive Oil Sector of Alto Palancia, Spain. *Sociologia Ruralis*
982 52, 215–234. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9523.2011.00558.x>
983
984 Morgan, K, Marsden, T., Murdoch, J., 2006. *Worlds of Food: Place, Power and Provenance in the Food*
985 *Chain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
986
987 Morgan, K., Santo, R., 2018. The rise of municipal food movements. In Kalfagianna, A. & Skordili, S.
988 (Eds.). *Localizing Global Food: Short Food Supply Chains as Responses to Agri-Food System Challenges*.
989 Routledge.
990
991 Morgan, K., Sonnino, R., 2010. The urban foodscape: World cities and the new food equation.
992 *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, 3, 209-224.
993
994 Packer, M.M., 2014. Civil subversion: Making "quiet revolution" with the Rhode Island Food Policy
995 Council. *Journal of Critical Thought and Praxis* 3 (1). <https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/jctp/vol3/iss1>
996
997 Parker, K., Horowitz, J.M., Brown, A., Fry, R., Cohn, D., Igielnik, R., 2018. What Unites and Divides Urban,
998 Suburban and Rural Communities. Pew Research Center: Social & Demographic Trends.
999 [http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2018/05/22/what-unites-and-divides-urban-suburban-and-rural-](http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2018/05/22/what-unites-and-divides-urban-suburban-and-rural-communities)
1000 [communities](http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2018/05/22/what-unites-and-divides-urban-suburban-and-rural-communities) [Accessed 7 September 2018].
1001
1002 Plastrik, P., Taylor, M., Cleveland, J., 2014. *Connecting to Change the World: Harnessing the Power of*
1003 *Networks for Social Impact*. Island Press, Washington, D.C.
1004

1005 Renting, H., Schermer, M., Rossi, A., 2012. Building food democracy: Exploring civic food networks and
1006 newly emerging forms of food citizenship. *International Journal of Sociology of Agriculture & Food* 19
1007 (3).
1008

1009 Santo, R., Yong, R., Palmer, A., 2014. Collaboration meets opportunity: The Baltimore Food Policy
1010 Initiative. *Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems, and Community Development* 4, 193-208.
1011 <http://dx.doi.org/10.5304/jafscd.2014.043.012>
1012

1013 Scherb, A., Palmer, A., Frattaroli, S., Pollack, K., 2012. Exploring food system policy: A survey of food
1014 policy councils in the United States. *Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems, and Community Development*
1015 2 (4), 3-14. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5304/jafscd.2012.024.007>
1016

1017 Schiff, R., 2008. The role of food policy councils in developing sustainable food systems. *Journal of*
1018 *Hunger & Environmental Nutrition* 3 (2-3), 206-228. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19320240802244017>
1019

1020 Scott, M., 2015. Re-theorizing social network analysis and environmental governance: Insights from
1021 human geography. *Progress in Human Geography* 39 (4), 449-463.
1022 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0309132514554322>
1023

1024 Sheingate, A., 2014. 'The new politics of food in the United States.' Paper presented to ECPR General
1025 Conference, The New Politics of Food and Agriculture, Panel P059: De-Compartmentalising Agricultural
1026 Policy Making? Glasgow, 3-6 September.
1027

1028 Sonnino, R., Moragues-Faus, A., Maggio, A., 2014. Sustainable food security: An emerging research and
1029 policy agenda. *International Journal of Sociology of Agriculture and Food* 21 (1), 173-188.
1030

1031 Sonnino, R., Marsden, T., 2006. Beyond the divide: Rethinking relationships between alternative and
1032 conventional food networks in Europe. *Journal of Economic Geography* 6 (2), 181-199.
1033 <https://doi.org/10.1093/jeg/lbi006>
1034

1035 Sustainable Food Cities Network (SFCN), 2016. 'About.' <http://sustainablefoodcities.org/> [Accessed 15
1036 May 2016].
1037

1038 Sustainable Food Cities Network (SFCN), 2018. 'Key issues.' <http://sustainablefoodcities.org/keyissues>
1039 [Accessed 8 August 2018].
1040

1041 Taylor, M., 2014. 'Being useful' after the Ivory Tower: Combining research and activism with the Brixton
1042 Pound. *Area* 46 (3), 305-312. <https://doi.org/10.1111/area.12117>
1043

1044 Thompson, G.F., 2004. Is all the world a complex network? *Economy and Society* 33 (3), 411-424.
1045 <https://doi.org/10.1080/0308514042000225725>
1046

1047 Tregear, A., 2011. Progressing knowledge in alternative and local food networks: Critical reflections and
1048 a research agenda. *Journal of Rural Studies* 27 (4), 419-430.
1049 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2011.06.003>
1050

- 1051 Weber, E.P., Khademian, A.M., 2008. Wicked problems, knowledge challenges, and collaborative
1052 capacity builders in network settings. *Public Administration Review*, 68 (2), 334-339.
1053 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2007.00866.x>
1054
- 1055 Whatmore, S., Thorne, L., 1997. Nourishing networks: Alternative geographies of food. In: Goodman, D.,
1056 Watts, M.J. (Eds.), *Globalising Food Agrarian Questions and Global Restructuring*, Routledge, London.
1057
- 1058 Wilkinson, J., 2005. Network theories and political economy: From attrition to convergence? *Research in*
1059 *Rural Sociology and Development* 12, 11-38.
1060
- 1061 Wright, K., 2001. Generosity vs. altruism: Philanthropy and charity in the United States and United
1062 Kingdom. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 12(4), 399-416.
1063

1064 Figure Captions

1065

1066

1067 **Figure 1** Rise of local food policy groups – and the networks which connect them – globally

1068

1069 Depiction of the rapid rise of LFPGs over past decade, particularly in the US, Canada, and UK, juxtaposed with the creation of
1070 national, international, and state/regional networks to connect the LFPGs.

1071

1072 Data compiled from CLF’s annual FPC directory update, SFCN website, websites and Facebook pages for LFPGs and state/
1073 regional networks, and personal communication. Other countries developing LFPGs include Belgium, Germany, New Zealand,
1074 and Spain. Other places, especially non-industrialized countries, may have different mechanisms for enacting municipal food
1075 policy reform, including traditional integrative food governance institutions not recorded in the English literature.

1076

1077 *State/regional networks were included above if they play a role in convening, training, and/or instigating LFGPs (>3) beyond
1078 any role focused on influencing state-level policy.

1079

1080 *13 LFGPs in the US and 24 in “other countries” counted in 2017 self-reported as still in development. 31 LFPGs in the US and 10
1081 in Canada also reported as being in transition (redefining the purpose and/or structure of their group).

1082

1083

1084

1085 **Table 1** Organizational characteristics and capacities of SFCN and FPN

1086 Sources: Websites, personal communication. Text in brackets indicates projects still in development or planned.

1087

1088 * SFCN issue areas: 1) public awareness about healthy, sustainable food, 2) food poverty, diet-related ill-health, healthy food
1089 access, 3) community food skills, 4) sustainable food economy, 5) food procurement, 6) food waste/ecological footprint.

1090

1091 *SFCN’s six flagship cities from 2013-16: Belfast, Bournemouth and Poole, Cardiff, Liverpool, Newcastle, and Stockport.

1091

1092

1093 **Figure 2** Network of networks: An example of international landscape of local food policy networks

1094

1095 An example of how an LFPG, itself a network of local food system stakeholders, may be embedded within a state or regional
1096 network of LFPGs (e.g., Ohio Local Food Policy Network above) as well as within the larger Food Policy Networks project, which
1097 connects food policy groups across North America. Note this figure only shows state/regional food policy networks if they play
1098 a role in convening, training, and/or instigating LFGPs (>3) beyond any role focused on influencing state-level policy.

1099

1100 * US signatories also members of US Conference of Mayors Food Policy Task Force

1101

1102 ** Formed during or since 2016

1102

1103

1104

1105

1106 **Figure 3** An example of the interconnectedness of food policy groups in the US

1107

1108 An illustration of how LFPGs may actually interact with other LFPGs, state FPGs, national networks, and other organizations in
1109 reality. Some LFPGs may only interact with another LFPG or two; others may interact deeply with their state FPG or FPN and
1110 few others; some may not interact with any “umbrella” networks or other organizations at all. In addition to connecting LFPGs
1111 within their state, state FPGs may also interact with other state-level organizations and networks. FPN also interacts with
1112 several national organizations and networks in addition to LFPGs and state FPGs.