

Framework Use #1: Evaluating an Activity



STEP 1: Determine your Activity

Briefly describe a food activity/ intervention (e.g., a policy, program, project, etc.) that you would like to assess using the Framework.



STEP 2: Identify its Outputs

List the outputs (the immediate tangible or intangible results) of your activity/ intervention.

STEP 3: Identify Relevant JEDI Outcomes



Review the list of JEDI outcomes below and identify which ones your activity/ its outputs contribute to. Rate the extent of this contribution in the box provided (minimal, moderate, or substantial).

**For full descriptions of justice dimensions and impacts, see Appendix.*

Justice Dimension 1: Recognitional Justice

Impact 1.1: Embracing difference

Outcomes	Contribution
1.1 Multiple goals, outcomes, and principles are represented in visions of the food system.	<input type="text"/>
1.2 Differing interpretations of problems and solutions are acknowledged and incorporated in food work.	<input type="text"/>
1.3 Processes are established to allow for differing or conflicting visions to resolve or coexist.	<input type="text"/>

Impact 1.2: Considering past, present & future

1.4 Historic and ongoing injustices (e.g., colonial legacies, intergenerational poverty, racism) are incorporated into how food system problems are framed, root causes are understood, and solutions are developed.	<input type="text"/>
1.5 Marginalized communities are recognised as experiencing hope, joy, resiliency and vibrancy in the past, present and future, rather than simply being framed as oppressed.	<input type="text"/>
1.6 The impact on future generations (of humans and other species) is intentionally incorporated into food systems planning (e.g., considering social, economic and environmental impacts).	<input type="text"/>

Justice Dimension 2: Procedural Justice

Impact 2.1: Capacity to participate

Outcomes	Contribution
2.1 Increased capacity of marginalized groups to address their own challenges and achieve their own objectives (e.g. organizational development, self-determination, resources, business development, food sovereignty).	<input type="text"/>
2.2 Increased knowledge and understanding of food system governance, processes and tools.	<input type="text"/>
2.3 Food-system grants/funding sources support community-determined priorities, are flexible, and have accessible, low-barrier application and reporting processes.	<input type="text"/>

Impact 2.2: Just processes

2.4 Reduced systemic power imbalances in governance (e.g., moving from top down, prescriptive, opaque approaches to more transparent, flexible and non-hierarchical approaches).	<input type="text"/>
2.5 Marginalized communities are leading, or are meaningfully engaged, throughout the planning, implementation and evaluation of policies and programs.	<input type="text"/>
2.6 Reduced barriers and increased safety to participate in food systems planning (e.g., offering financial stipends, childcare, transportation, language translation, etc).	<input type="text"/>

Justice Dimension 3: Distributive Justice

Impact 3.1: Access to food

Outcomes	Contribution
3.1 Increased food security for marginalized groups (e.g., access to nutritious, culturally preferred and affordable food).	<input type="text"/>
3.2 Processes are established to identify individuals or groups experiencing/ at risk of food insecurity.	<input type="text"/>
3.3 Greater Indigenous food sovereignty/ food sovereignty (i.e., more local control over distribution, supply and production).	<input type="text"/>
3.4 Increased resilience in local food systems to ensure they can withstand natural disasters, economic shocks, and supply chain disruptions.	<input type="text"/>
3.5 Increased food literacy so people can participate in their food system in whatever way they choose (e.g., gardening, preserving classes, nutrition, cooking, cultural/ traditional food practices, etc.).	<input type="text"/>

Impact 3.2: Labour justice

3.6 Fair, adequate and equitable pay in food-related jobs (i.e., across genders and races, providing at minimum a living wage).	<input type="text"/>
3.7 Increased employee support (e.g., health insurance, training, adequate staffing) and safety from pollution, hazards, weather and other adverse conditions in workspaces.	<input type="text"/>

3.8 Increased access to food system jobs/business opportunities and infrastructure (e.g., farmland, processing facilities, distribution chains, etc.) for marginalized groups and rural/remote communities.

Impact 3.3: Respectful relationships

Outcomes

Contribution

3.9 Reciprocal relationships between marginalized groups (e.g., racialized, Indigenous, LGBTQ2SI+, low-income, women) and dominant groups (e.g., white, cis, hetero, white-collar workers/managerial class) are established.

3.10 Marginalized food actors have opportunities to provide feedback on partnership relations.

3.11 Reciprocal relationships between different food actors (e.g., farmers, processors, distributors, food access organizations, funders) are established.

3.12 Humans have an ethical (versus exploitative and harmful) relationship with the animals, plants, and land needed for food (e.g., animal welfare, reduced food waste, agroecological practices, increased biodiversity and ecosystem health).

STEP 4: Reflection and Verification



Using the Framework relies on the assumption that your activity outputs actually contribute to your selected outcomes in a meaningful way. Step 4 involves exploring how you might verify these linkages to reduce bias. Review your selected outcomes and reflect, discuss and determine:

- *Where possible, how can you measure or verify that your activity / its outputs actually contribute to each of the selected outcomes? (Please note, some outcomes are qualitative in nature and can be more difficult to measure).*

**List the outcome # followed by how it will be measured/verified.*

Example: "Outcome 3.1 - description of how to verify."

- *In cases where your activity only minimally contributed to an outcome, what steps can you take (if any) to further support that outcome?*

STEP 5: Gap Analysis and Reflection



*Review the outcomes that you did **not** select because they are not affected by your activity. Reflect and discuss:*

- *Are any of these outcomes relevant to / within the scope of your activity and your organization? If yes, what barriers have prevented you from taking action thus far? (e.g., financial or human resources, knowledge gap, etc.)*

**List the within-scope outcome # followed by the barrier.*

Example: "Outcome 1.3 - description of barrier."

- *How can you overcome these barriers and what can be done to contribute to these JEDI outcomes?*

Appendix:

Justice Dimensions & Impacts

Justice Dimension 1: Recognitional Justice

Different values, life experiences, and knowledge systems inform people's food practices and the meaning they attribute to these practices. For example, race, culture, gender, and ability-level influences how people interact with food. However, the mainstream food system often limits this difference from thriving by privileging certain values and food traditions over others, such as those that perpetuate individualism and neoliberal capitalism, which ultimately shape food system policies, practices, and interventions.

For example, late-stage capitalism requires people to earn enough money to buy food and to prevent hunger. Colonialism limits Indigenous Peoples' ability to access traditional foods in public settings because the food must meet legislative guidelines, and the law established to protect the safety of the food supply is often experienced as an impediment to traditional gathering and distribution of food. In North America, local food movements and the rise in associated farmers markets have been critiqued for being predominantly White and serving affluent communities. The lack of culturally appropriate food in procurement programs have resulted in calls for food diversity and greater attention to cultural preferences, demonstrating the need for increased diversity of food options. Recognitional justice asks us to consider whose values are being normalised or oppressed, how to challenge this division, and what can be done to value difference.

Impact 1.1: Embracing difference

Embracing difference moves away from privileging certain values while oppressing others by providing space for differing values, experiences, and knowledge systems to co-exist and be shared. Differences can also elicit conflict. This impact suggests that rather than seeing conflict as something to be managed and removed, consider how it can be generative. Ultimately, embracing difference helps to build strong and equitable relationships.

Impact 1.2: Considering past, present and future

Food system problems or solutions are often framed by looking at the present. Who is affected? How are they harmed? To what extent? Looking at an issue's historical roots shifts framing away from present-day damage or deficit, and towards recognizing that inequities stem from historic and ongoing forms of oppression (e.g., colonialism, racism, patriarchy).

Inequities also arise when food systems are built on singular visions and goals that overlook diversity and the needs of future generations. Unfortunately, not all groups have equal power to shape the future, some organizations and communities are better resourced to enact their future plans than others. To reduce inequities, this impact calls food actors to account for historical and persisting legacies of oppression, ensure a diversity of perspectives, and consider the long-term impacts of interventions on future food systems.

Justice Dimension 2: Procedural Justice

Procedural justice asks us to consider who makes decisions and how. Decision-making power is often concentrated among a select few. However, due to inherent biases, strategies that prove effective for one individual or group may not necessarily benefit another. When certain groups are excluded from political, social, and economic processes and opportunities, inequities emerge.

Procedural justice aims to address this issue by removing barriers and facilitating meaningful participation in decision making, moving beyond tokenistic participation and towards a distribution of power to communities. It honours the approach of “nothing for us without us”. In other words, any decisions that impact communities should be decided by the community members themselves.

Impact 2.1: Capacity to participate

This impact seeks to uplift people’s capacity to engage with decision making processes (in traditional forms of government and self-government). This requires acknowledging and reducing capacity-related disparities and barriers of different social groups to ensure all people have access to the knowledge, skills, resources and funding needed to meaningfully engage in food system governance (either to decide to build their own tables or to sit at existing decision-making tables). Valuing and supporting the ways that marginalized groups already organize themselves and supporting the creation of diverse organizations and governance structures is vital to this effort.

Impact 2.2: Just processes

Just processes question the structures and systems that determine who is designing, delivering, and enforcing procedures and processes. It seeks to examine how decisions are made and what is prioritized. While having seats at the table is an important first step, these spaces must be accessible and safe for people. If not, you risk causing additional harm. It is important to acknowledge and meaningfully address barriers to participation. Planning and decision making must respect and centre relationships by moving at the speed of trust.

Justice Dimension 3: Distributive Justice

Distributive justice calls for the equitable distribution of resources and the fair sharing of benefits (e.g., safe and nutritious food) and burdens (e.g., exposure to pesticides, malnutrition) in the food system. Here, 'benefits' and 'burdens' refer to both tangible and intangible factors, such as access to food, land, opportunities, partnerships and other resources.

Currently, these are not equitably distributed. For instance, low-income groups, Indigenous communities and racialized populations are often at greater risk of food insecurity and have less access to land. To move towards distributive justice, food practitioners should consider: who will be impacted by our actions, and how can we deliver benefits to those who are in the most need?

Impact 3.1: Access to food

The "physical and economic access to sufficient, safe, and nutritious food... at all times..." is internationally recognized as a fundamental human right (FAO, 2008). Marginalised groups often face barriers to realising this right. This impact aims to address food security at the household and community level. This includes exploring the following questions: is there enough food? How stable is the food supply? Is the food easy to access, high in quality and culturally appropriate?

Impact 3.2: Labour justice

Fair labour conditions for workers in food systems include ensuring fair compensations, safe working conditions, the ability of self-employment, and the power to make decisions on issues affecting their livelihoods (e.g., land use decisions relating to farmland).

Impact 3.3: Respectful relationships

A just food system requires examining its various relationships and the power dynamics between them. This includes developing accountable, reciprocal and respectful relationships between humans, the environment, and non-humans (e.g., animals, plants, fungi, insects, etc.). This impact aims to challenge harmful power relations, and to encourage reciprocal relations, especially between marginalised and dominant groups.