

Appendix A: Methodology

Aims and Objectives

The key aims of the project were to:

- Research the current impact and effectiveness of Community Food Enterprises in delivering food policy goals
- Understand the level of awareness that Community Food Enterprises have of the role they are playing in food policy
- Provide Defra and the Cabinet Office with clear recommendations of how they can support community food enterprises in effectively delivering food policy

The objectives of the research were to:

- Map and describe community food enterprises in the South West of England
- Provide evidence of the impact and effectiveness of community food enterprises in delivering food policy goals.
- Help community food enterprises become aware of the role they are playing in food policy
- Through case studies show how community food enterprises develop and learn – the journey they take
- Identify opportunities for community food enterprises in helping deliver policy goals and the key barriers to growth

To achieve these objectives, the research was divided into two key stages:

1. Mapping social enterprises in the South West with an interest and involvement in food
2. Selection of twelve case studies and detailed analysis of data from these cases using a set of eight hypotheses

Scope

The research focussed on the South West of England, and looked in depth at twelve Community Food Enterprises. It was a small-scale study: whilst the results are valid and provide important insights about Community Food Enterprises, care should be taken in making broad assumptions about all Community Food Enterprises, or all areas of England or the UK.

The research with the twelve case study enterprises was undertaken by the different partners through semi-structured interviews with key staff, volunteers and customers. As such their own different perspectives will have been brought into the way they engaged with the enterprises. While there was a topic guide and general guidance followed by all, this was kept deliberately flexible to allow for the differences in the enterprises and keep the discussions relatively open. This may have minor implications for how comparable the findings across the enterprises are.

As a qualitative study, a certain amount of interpretation has been undertaken, both by the partners involved and the social enterprises themselves. Where this is the case, the report makes that clear.

The Roundtable Group

A “roundtable” event was held in Bristol in July 2010, attended by the partners, Defra and four experts in the field of food policy and social enterprise in July 2010. The four experts were selected to supplement the knowledge of the project partners by including academic knowledge, food links expertise, local authority knowledge and community supported agriculture expertise. They were:

Prof Kevin Morgan	University of Cardiff
Tim Crabtree	Bridport Food Links
Mike Atkinson	Somerset County Council
Traci Lewis	Soil Association

At this meeting, the data obtained from the mapping exercise was shared and the group identified the opportunities and barriers to be explored through the

action research. Criteria for selecting the case-study enterprises were drawn up, and the research methodology was approved. A common approach around engaging and interacting with the community food enterprises was agreed.

The following sections explore the way in which the research principles established by the Roundtable were put into practice. The “research team” referred to are the employees and contractors of the project organisations who carried out the work.

Mapping Community Food Enterprise

An initial mapping exercise was undertaken using desk research to identify and describe the Community Food sector in the South West of England. The research team sought to identify all community enterprises in the South West that are involved in the production, processing, selling or serving of food. Using existing datasets from databases held by Co-operatives UK, Locality, Social Enterprise Coalition, RISE and the Plunkett Foundation, combined with knowledge from the various partners, a single dataset for the South West was created. This gave a snapshot of the number of such enterprises and the types of activity they undertook. It also revealed the size and scale of the sector in one region of the country.

Classifying Co-operatives

The research team took the decision not to classify certain types of co-operative as Community Food Enterprises. There were:

1. Traditional Consumer Co-operatives – There are a large number of co-operative supermarkets and stores in the region (“The Co-operative”). These are owned by their members but are part of structures far larger than the region. Because of their size and reach way beyond the 30-50 miles locality used for this study, they were excluded.

2. Agricultural co-operatives – There are many based in the region, but in most cases they are run by farmers for the benefit of farmers and are not connected to the wider local community. Only those with direct community connections have been included.

3. Distribution co-operatives – Where private sector enterprises come together to distribute food, it can be debated whether this creates a social enterprise or whether the main interest is still private profit. Decisions were taken on a case-by-case basis, and only those which can be classified as a social enterprise have been included.

Categorizing the data

The next task was to better understand the data set by categorizing the Community Food Enterprises into a number of sub sectors. This methodology aids in being able to classify and sort what is otherwise a relatively large and varied grouping of community enterprises each of which has food on their agenda.

Table 1 below gives an overview of the Community Food Sector dataset, showing the categories and types which were used:

Table 1

	Category	Type	Number
	Retail	Community shops	77
	Retail	Farmers markets	17
	Retail	Country markets	14
	Retail	Cafes/catering	14
	Community growing	Community supported agriculture	35
	Community growing	Community farming	24
	Community growing	Allotments/growing	6
	Production/processing/distribution	Food hubs	51
	Production/processing/distribution	Food co-ops	20
	Production/processing/distribution	Farmer co-ops marketing	9
	Production/processing/distribution	Farmer co-ops producing	3
	Production/processing/distribution	Other	5
	Initiatives	Transition	43
	Initiatives	Other	36
	Not classified		16
	Total		370

Refining the Typology

The full list of community food enterprises types identified in the data mapping exercise is shown in table 1 above. The Roundtable group needed to refine these categories further in order to select representative cases to study.

Consideration was given to the number of enterprises, the potential growth of

each type and its likelihood of contributing to food policy goals. The final typology decided upon is shown below:

Type 1:	Community Shop – local food focus
Type 2:	Community Shops – broad food focus
Type 3:	Buying group/food co-operative
Type 4:	Development Trust
Type 5:	Worker co-operative
Type 6:	Transition initiative
Type 7:	Co-operatively run farmers market
Type 8:	Community supported agriculture
Type 9:	Area based policy initiative
Type 10:	Farmers co-operative linking with consumers
Type 11:	Food links project
Type 12:	Multi-agenda community enabler

Selecting Case Studies

The research team then selected twelve Community Food Enterprises to exemplify each of the twelve types. A number of different enterprises were assessed for suitability to take part in this research, using three selection criteria:

1. The strength of the individual enterprises' connection with food
2. The connection with community action on food
3. The level of co-ordination of local food activity.

The final selection was made by the project partners, who each selected the enterprises closest to their area of expertise.

	Food Enterprise Type	Name of Enterprise
1	Community-owned shop with strong local food	Berrynarbor community-owned Shop
2	Community-owned shop with strong food culture	Thorncombe community-owned Shop
3	Buying group/food cooperative	Eastover Organics
4	Development Trust – City Farm	St Werburgh's City Farm
5	Worker Cooperative	Somerset Organic Link
6	Transition initiative	Shaftesbury Home Grown
7	Cooperatively run Farmers Market	Vale of Taunton Farmers' Market
8	Community supported agriculture	Stroud Community Agriculture
9	Area based policy initiative	Exeter area (7 enterprises)
10	Farmer cooperative linking with consumers	Somerset Local Food Direct Somerset Organic Link
11	Food links project	Bridport Local Food Links
12	Multi agenda community enabler	Stroud Common Wealth

Interviewing Case Study Enterprises

The five partners split the individual case study research between them with four days allocated to each enterprise. The Soil Association was also invited to participate given its involvement with the Roundtable and expertise in working with community agriculture schemes. The partner organisations selected case study researchers, chosen because of their knowledge of the sector and their relevant experience of the opportunities and threats to these enterprises. In this way they were able to engage knowledgeably with the enterprises, add their own experience to the debate and able to place the work in a wider context. Consistency was achieved by having a common set of questions, but the researchers were free to identify the best way of engaging with their particular enterprise. This has added an extra dimension to the research and has meant that the enterprises themselves have benefited from the exchange of views and experiences.

This research approach gave three outcomes that a traditional approach would not have done:

- The researchers were able to judge and comment on how typical the responses were compared to other, similar Community Food Enterprises
- The research was available to the project partner organisations to help shape their future support of Community Food Enterprises and in their engagement with Defra.
- In many cases, the researcher will continue to have a relationship with the case studies.

The agreed set of research questions can be seen in Appendix C. The case studies themselves are in Appendix D

Data Analysis

The quantifiable data from the case study research is presented in table form and can be seen in Appendix B.

The Roundtable group discussed and agreed a set of hypotheses against which the data from the case studies could be tested, based on their collective knowledge of the sector. The hypotheses are:

Hypothesis One: Communities are inspired and motivated to take more control of the food they eat. Inspired communities are well placed to increase public understanding of, and community connection with, food policy.

Hypothesis Two: A powerful lever for behavioural change is communities seeing action on food exemplified within their communities.

Hypothesis Three: Despite having no awareness of Food 2030, the community food enterprises are helping to deliver many of the policy objectives in it

Hypothesis Four: Community food enterprises take on the role of providing food education to their community

Hypothesis Five: Food policy initiatives are good areas for business opportunities

Hypothesis Six: Collaboration between enterprises is positive and to be encouraged

Hypothesis Seven: For Big Society to become a reality a big challenge is to find areas of interest that people are drawn towards – food is one of those draws.

Hypothesis Eight: Community food enterprises add value across other Defra agendas as well as across a wider cross government range of issues

The findings of the analysis are discussed in Chapter 3.

Case Study Conference

The researchers wrote up all the interviews with the case studies. These are included in the report and have not been edited in any way. Once the individual case studies had been completed a case study conference was held in Taunton in November 2010. The objectives of the day were to share the case studies and to reflect and discuss the implications of what has been discovered. It was attended by the five partners, the twelve researchers, and representatives from each of the case studies as well as Defra staff.

The Case Study Conference was rare in the local food world as it put a wide variety of Community Food Enterprise types together. For many participants this was the first interaction that they had had with some of the other enterprise types. The assumption was that putting the case studies together would help each to find common cause with other enterprises that they had previously had little or no contact with. Each case study presented its findings and participants were then put into groups to explore what they saw as the learnings from the work. The results of the day were striking with a strong sense of excitement from participants that they were part of one community food enterprise sector that could learn much from each other. They also were

inspired to work alongside Defra staff and to understand how food policy connected with their day-to-day activity. The findings of the day have been used to help shape the key findings.

Appendix B: Tables

Table 1: Results of new dataset

	Category	Type	Number
	Retail	Community shops	77
	Retail	Farmers markets	17
	Retail	Country markets	14
	Retail	Cafes/catering	14
	Community growing	Community supported agriculture	35
	Community growing	Community farming	24
	Community growing	Allotments/growing	6
	Production/processing/distribution	Food hubs	51
	Production/processing/distribution	Food co-ops	20
	Production/processing/distribution	Farmer co-ops marketing	9
	Production/processing/distribution	Farmer co-ops producing	3
	Production/processing/distribution	Other	5
	Initiatives	Transition	43
	Initiatives	Other	36
	Not classified		16
	Total		370

Table 2: location of enterprise, turnover, number of employees, year started and legal structure adopted.

	Enterprise Type	Location	Number of enterprises	Turnover per annum	Employees WTE	Year Started	Legal Structure
1	Community-owned shop with strong local food	Berrynarbor	1	135,000	1	2004	IPS - Coop ¹
2	Community-owned shop with strong food culture	Thorncombe	1	120,000	1	2009	IPS – Ben Com ²
3	Buying group/food cooperative	Eastover	1	5,000	0	2005	Unincorporated food coop
4	Development Trust – City Farm	St Werburghs	1	163,000	7	1980	Company ltd by guarantee
5	Worker Cooperative	Somerset	1	350,000	3	2001	Company limited by shares
6	Transition initiative	Shaftesbury	1	2,500		2008	Currently under consideration
7	Cooperatively run Farmers Market	Taunton	1	30,000 ³		1999	IPS - Coop
8	Community supported agriculture	Stroud	1	102,000	3	2002	IPS - ?
9	Area based policy initiative	Exeter	7	749,000		2004	Various: IPS's, charities
10	Farmer cooperative linking with consumers	Somerset	1	400,000	2	2001	Not for profit ltd company
11	Food links project	Bridport	1	500,000		1999	IPS – Ben Com
12	Multi agenda community enabler	Stroud	1	55,000		1999	Company ltd by guarantee

¹ IPS – Coop: Industrial and Provident Society Cooperative

² IPS – Ben Com: Industrial and Provident Society for the benefit of the community

³ This is the turnover of the operating company (actual market turnover is £475,000 per annum)

Table 3: funding streams used on start-up.

	Enterprise	Amount raised	Community Shares/loans	Community Fundraising	Gov grants	Gov loans	Other Grants/loans	Advice
1	Berrynarbor community-owned shop	£145,000	£15,000 shares	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes
2	Thorncombe community-owned shop	£207,000		£20,000		£127,000	£60,000	Yes
3	Eastover buying group/food cooperative	£700			£700			Yes
4	Development Trust – city farm	?			Yes		Yes	Yes
5	Somerset worker cooperative	?			Yes			Yes
6	Shaftesbury transition initiative	£13,000			£13,000			Yes
7	Taunton farmers market	None						
8	Stroud community supported agriculture	None						
9	Exeter area based policy initiative	Various						
10	Somerset farmer cooperative	?	£14,000		Yes. RES £180,000			
		?			Yes			Yes
11	Bridport food links project	?						
12	Stroud multi agenda community enabler	?	Yes loans		Yes		Yes	Yes

Table 4: What prompted the enterprises to set up and key areas of focus

	Enterprise	Prompted to set up	Key priority areas of focus
1	Berrynarbor community-owned shop	To keep a shop and post office Provision of on local food	1 st class shop and PO, promotion of local food, social impact in village
2	Thorncombe community-owned shop	To keep shop and post office	Shop for all, social community hub, support vulnerable, reduce environmental impact, support local economy
3	Eastover buying group/food cooperative	Supply fresh organic produce and wholefoods	Supply fresh organic, eating local, reducing transport miles, sustainability of food supply system
4	Development Trust – city farm	Turn derelict demolition site into working livestock farm	Run by local people, selling produce and providing space and equipment for recreational and educational activities
5	Somerset worker cooperative	Need to find new markets	To supply local food to local people developing range of local market opportunities
6	Shaftesbury transition initiative	Out of Transition Towns Shaftesbury	Community project that brings people together to grow and produce food locally
7	Taunton farmers market	Opportunity to provide farmers with direct route to customers	Support producer livelihoods, need customer base to expand, increase conversion rate, weekly markets
8	Stroud community supported agriculture	Support organic and biodynamic agriculture, new economic model based on mutual benefit	Making farm work, making community work, making finances work and furthering principles of set up
9	Exeter area based policy initiative	Individual organisations with local food initiatives	By working collaboratively to increase their impact supporting future food security
10	Somerset farmer cooperative	Local produce direct to local customers	Recruit new customers as numbers have dropped sharply with recession. Two categories – knowledgeable and older people
11	Bridport food links project	Better food system more connected to locality	Hot meals to primary schools and older people of Dorset
12	Stroud multi agenda community enabler	As a think tank to support Stroud community initiatives	Providing advice, enable innovation, behaviour change initiator

Appendix C: Interview Guidance

Food Policy Prompts

Food 2030 Core issues	Areas to explore with enterprises
Encouraging people to eat a healthy sustainable diet	<p>Is there evidence that the CFE is increasing understanding of healthy, sustainable diets?</p> <p>Is it contributing to its community being able to access healthy, sustainable food?</p> <p>Does it contribute to food safety?</p> <p>Does it help people understand the origin of their food or to grow their own food?</p> <p>Does it help with increasing people's food skills?</p>
Ensuring a resilient profitable and competitive food system	<p>Does it encourage an interest in where food comes from?</p> <p>Does it promote the recognition of high quality standards in food production?</p> <p>Does it offer farmers and producers a way to add value to their products?</p>
Increasing food production sustainably	<p>Does it help farmers to respond to changes in the market?</p> <p>Does it make farmers more competitive?</p> <p>Does it help to expand fruit and vegetable production?</p> <p>Does it help minimise large-scale land use changes?</p> <p>Does it protect wildlife and biodiversity?</p>
Reducing the food system's greenhouse gas emissions	<p>How aware are your customers on the impact their food choices have on climate change?</p> <p>Are there examples of how your enterprise is reducing its emissions?</p> <p>Does your supply chain help reduce emissions?</p>
Reducing, reusing and reprocessing waste	<p>Do you encourage your customers not to waste food?</p> <p>Do you offer any advice or support on reducing food waste?</p> <p>How do you reduce food waste in your own enterprise?</p>
Increasing the impact of skills, knowledge, research and technology	<p>Are there any examples of you using innovative technology and research in your enterprise?</p>

Case Study Guidance

Overall objectives

To produce a case study of a Community Food Enterprise (CFE) in the South West which would:

- inform policy formers of the nature of this type of CFE
- explain its role in delivering food policy and other policy outcomes
- identify the impact the CFE has for the individuals directly involved and the wider community
- identify and begin to develop business opportunities that a greater emphasis on food policy outcomes might generate
- identify opportunities for CFE to respond to food issues

Methodology

The partner responsible for the case study will identify an enterprise and appoint a case-study co-ordinator. The co-ordinator will have three days to carry out the work and the enterprise can claim 2 days for the work.

The co-ordinator will devise a method of working with the enterprise that would answer the questions below. The best way of doing this will vary for each enterprise. However, the co-ordinator needs to be objective and should not lead the enterprise to overstate their contribution.

We encourage the co-ordinator to engage with the customers and suppliers/producers of the CFE as well as the volunteers, particularly on the points about benefits to the community and behaviours influenced by the CFE's activities.

Whilst the co-ordinators will be conducting research in a more informal way, it is still research and therefore should be conducted as per the MRS professional code of conduct. This includes the following guidelines (for the full list, please see the annex):

- Participation in research activities is based on voluntary informed consent.
- Researchers shall be transparent as to the subject and purpose of data collection.
- Researchers shall respect the confidentiality of information collected in their professional activities.

Once the work with the CFE is complete, the co-ordinator will produce a simple case study covering the points below.

The co-ordinator and the enterprise would attend the event on November 24th and would make a brief presentation of their findings.

What needs to be reported back

1. Basic information – Turnover, employees, customer base, year started, stage of development, legal structure, funding streams used.
2. What prompted the volunteers to set up the CFE in the first place
3. What are the key priority areas of focus?
4. Has the work of the CFE evolved over time – if yes why and how?
5. What motivates them to continue the CFE?
6. Are there examples of their work influencing behaviours in their community?
 - a. Capture positive (or negative) behaviours around food
 - b. Also capture influence on any other behaviours (please see Annex for prompt list)
7. Do they carry out any education activities on food?
8. What other benefits to they bring to society through their work, such as environmental or health impacts?

- i. for local producers
 - ii. for their customers
 - iii. for the CFE volunteers
 - iv. for their community
9. (This broad question is designed to capture the much wider benefits that CFEs can bring on top of their food-based benefits. Interviewees should be asked to identify ideas without prompting, then prompted if needed. The impact on volunteers of working with the CFE is likely to be a source of information, as is possible community spirit or cohesion.)
10. In what ways do they engage with their community, producers and their customers? Explore any other observations they have about the value and strength of their relationship with the above groups.
11. Do they feel motivated by discussing and hearing about what impacts their enterprise has on the community?
12. (This is about capturing the role feedback can play)
13. What contact do they have with local, regional or national government? Explore how important these relationships are, how satisfactory they are and what their relationship would be like ideally if they are not entirely satisfied. Also explore whether this contact is initiated by themselves looking for information (if so, what types of information – e.g. grants, animal welfare, regulations etc) or by the local, regional or national government.
14. What are the main barriers that their CFE has faced, and is likely to face going forwards, in its development? What things do they plan to do to overcome these barriers, or what help/support might they need to do so?
15. Thinking about the CFE's stages of development, where there or are there any particular moments that more support or guidance would have been helpful?

16. What aspects of food policy are they involved in delivering? A prompt sheet has been produced based on the Food 2030 strategy. Please use this as your structure, but do not feel that you have to answer every question. Does the knowledge that they are feeding into Government's agenda make their work more or less motivational?
17. Do they recognise and empathise with current food policy issues?
18. Having explored the main elements of Food Policy 2030, are there any business opportunities that could be developed from this? Returning to the areas explored in Question 9, explore whether there is anything which they could do more of, introduce or do better, or indeed if there is an appetite to do this.