



Nottingham Trent
University



Nottingham
City Council



Nottinghamshire
County Council

Summary: Roadmap to More Sustainable, Local Food Procurement in Nottingham and Nottinghamshire

Researcher: Charles Walker (charles.walker2022@my.ntu.ac.uk), Research Consultant, Action Research & Communications

Project Lead: Stacia Stetkiewicz (stacia.stetkiewicz@nottingham.ac.uk), Assistant Professor, Sustainable Agricultural Systems, University of Nottingham

Project Partners: University of Nottingham; Nottingham Trent University; Nottingham City Council, and Nottinghamshire County Council

With thanks to: OmniAction; ReLondon; Bath & North East Somerset Council; Birmingham Sustainable Food Partnership; Leicestershire Sustainable Food Partnership and all the interviewees who took part in this study

Disclaimer: The following report presents a synthesis of evidence and stakeholder consultations to inform the next steps in the development of a more sustainable, local food system in Nottingham/shire with respect to public food procurement. In keeping with the approach adopted in the ongoing development of a City of Nottingham Sustainable Food Partnership, the author's intention is to inspire stakeholders to co-design objectives and actions with respect to public food procurement that support a whole-system approach to food in our area. This document is not an "official blueprint" for sustainable procurement in Nottingham/shire, rather it is a proposal, made in good faith, to stimulate discussion and action.

This work has been generously supported by Civic Impact Champion Programme at the Institute for Policy Engagement at the University of Nottingham (February – July 2024)

Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 1. Context: Why sustainable, local food procurement matters | 3 |
| 2.The Road Map Project: What we did | 3 |
| 3.Opportunities for Nottingham/shire Institutions to Establish More Sustainable, Local Food Procurement | 4 |
| 3.1. Opportunities for Nottingham/shire: Labelling and Accreditation | 4 |
| 3.2. Opportunities for Nottingham/shire: Environmental Benefits | 4 |
| 3.2i Reducing Consumption-based GHG Emissions | 4 |
| 3.2ii Food Waste | 6 |
| 3.2iii Biodiversity | 6 |
| 3.3. Opportunities for Nottingham/shire: Economic Benefits | 6 |
| 3.4. Opportunities for Nottingham: Social Benefits | 9 |
| 4.Our Roadmap to More Sustainable, Local Food Procurement in Nottingham/shire | 10 |
| 5.Criteria for Successful Development of Sustainable, Local Food Procurement | 11 |
| 6. Recommendations for Next Steps: Short-term opportunities for Nottingham/shire Institutions to work together to enhance sustainable, local food procurement | 12 |
| 7.Conclusion | 16 |
| 8.Bibliography | 17 |

1.Context: Why sustainable, local food procurement matters

Food is one of the most important drivers of environmental change (Willett et al 2016). Globally, the production and consumption of food and management of waste accounts for 20-34% of anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions (Molin et al 2021; Willett et al 2016; Crippa et al 2021).

The United Nations Sustainable Development Goals include a commitment (Goal 12) to ensure sustainable production and consumption of food, which is described as a “key to sustaining the livelihoods of current and future generations” (UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs).

Sustainable public food procurement is described as a “game-changer” by the United Nations, since establishing effective sustainability criteria could dramatically impact the production, consumption and waste management of food, leading to significant environmental, economic and social benefits (FAO 2021).

Nationally, public sector spending on food is estimated at £2.1 billion annually (CCS 2024). For the four anchor institutions included in this study, University of Nottingham, Nottingham Trent University (NTU), Nottingham City Council (NCC), and Nottinghamshire County Council (Notts CC) we have roughly estimated a total annual spend on food of around £40 million. The scale of this spend means that even small, incremental changes in procurement have the potential for significant sustainability impacts.

2.The Road Map Project: What we did

This project was commissioned by the University of Nottingham in partnership with NTU, NCC and Notts CC to develop a roadmap to a dynamic procurement system to enable sustainable food purchasing in Nottingham/shire. During the course of our research, our focus shifted to a broader consideration of sustainable food procurement, which looks at potential actions beyond dynamic purchasing. As a result, our report may be better described as a “Roadmap to More Sustainable, Local Food Procurement in Nottingham and Nottinghamshire”.

Our aim was to understand sustainable food procurement policy and practice in the four anchor institutions and consider how they could work together to deliver even more environmental, economic and social benefits.

We have conducted a literature review to identify the potential benefits associated with public food procurement. Through interviews with local actors and policy analysis we have then mapped existing policy of the four institutions against the potential benefits of more sustainable food procurement.

We have undertaken further policy analysis and interviews with respect to public food procurement in other areas to source ideas about how our food system could be developed. This included London, Birmingham, Bath & North East Somerset, Leicestershire, The Marches, South Wales, and the North East Food Security Alliance.

In total, 13 people were interviewed for this project, which included local stakeholders, as well as actors in food systems in other areas, which kindly acted as case studies. Interviewees included, procurement officers, catering managers, public health officials, policy officers and Sustainable Food Partnership coordinators.

In July, we held a workshop with local procurement and catering managers, academics, and policy makers, and external experts, to share initial findings of this work and gather views on “next steps”.

Based on the insights obtained, this report puts forward a roadmap towards more sustainable, local food procurement; a list of criteria which appear prerequisites for successful development of public food procurement; and recommendations on next steps among institutions in Nottingham and Nottinghamshire.

We propose that this report be considered by stakeholders and the members of the proposed Sustainable Procurement Working Group (SPWG) of the City of Nottingham Sustainable Food Partnership. The City of Nottingham SFP plans to hold the inaugural meeting of its steering group in September.

The recommendations suggest areas within which the SPWG may wish to focus initial discussions based on policy convergence among the four institutions, local expertise and interest, as well as the availability of informative case studies from other parts of the UK.

This report is a summary of a more detailed document which will be provided to members of the proposed Sustainable Procurement Working Group of the City of Nottingham Sustainable Food Partnership, when the SFP is launched later this year.

3. Opportunities for Nottingham/shire Institutions to Establish More Sustainable, Local Food Procurement

3.1. Opportunities for Nottingham/shire: Labelling and Accreditation

In practice, labelling and accreditation schemes play a central role in validating food procurement decisions with respect to all three pillars of sustainability

OmniAction, a global network of food systems specialists and scientists in business, academia and policy, is evaluating existing labels to establish agreement on sustainability standards, with nutritional density at the centre of the project

The not-for-profit organisation is working with Birmingham City Council and the Food Foundation to create a toolkit to support procurement officers in making decisions on sustainable food supply. OmniAction presented its work to stakeholders in the four local institutions at the July workshop and there will be an opportunity to share the learning from Birmingham with the Nottingham/shire food system (reports expected in late 2024/early 2025).

3.2. Opportunities for Nottingham/shire: Environmental Benefits

(i). Reducing Consumption-based GHG Emissions: Influencing food choices

All four institutions have a strong policy focus on reducing GHG emissions.

The vast majority of GHG emissions associated with food occur on the farm. A detailed study of GHG emissions associated with the London food system found 75% of emissions occurred on the farm, 10% in the packaging phase and 10% as a result of transport (Malone et al 2021). Targeting on-farm emissions has significant potential to reduce GHGs associated with food.

There is work underway to explore the measurement of on-farm GHG emissions and how a system could be developed to inform local public food procurement (e.g. Leicestershire case study: Leicestershire County Council 2023). However, while these systems are likely to be hugely important in the future, they are not currently routinely in use within the supply chain and neither are the agroecological farming methods that can reduce emissions.

As a result, some public food procurement systems (e.g. London case study; Malone et al 2021) are aiming to influence menu choices in schools and institutional catering, as well as in the private sector, to reduce the consumption of food associated with exceptionally high levels of GHG emissions e.g. beef. The table shows the carbon emissions for meat products commonly used in school food menus in Leicestershire, with a comparison to lentils and chickpeas.

| Product | 'In store' footprint (kg CO ₂ e per kg) |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| Beef, UK average | 32 |
| Lamb, UK average | 32 |
| Minced meat 50/50 beef & pork | 10 |
| Pork Loin | 7.3 |
| Pork, boneless shoulder | 6.2 |
| Pork, UK average | 6.1 |
| Pork Sausages, 68% pork | 5.9 |
| Chicken nuggets, frozen | 4.5 |
| Chicken breast, boneless and skinless | 4.0 |
| Chicken carcass, UK | 2.4 |
| Chicken drumstick | 1.9 |
| Dry lentils | 1.15 |
| Dry chickpeas | 1.08 |

Leicestershire County Council 2023/CarbonCloud

There is experience in Nottingham/shire of influencing food choices e.g. at the University of Nottingham, where vegetarian and vegan menu choices have significantly increased following various interventions in Halls of Residence. Hence, there is an opportunity for local institutions to explore their policy aims around reducing GHG emissions, build upon their experience and potentially align objectives around reducing consumption-based emissions.

Targeting consumption-based emissions not only has the potential to deliver a significant shift in carbon emissions, it may also have wider benefits in supporting policy aims around healthy food choices and links to the social benefits associated with local public food procurement (see below).

The focus on consumption-based emissions does not suggest that agroecological farming methods and the on-farm measurement of GHG emissions and biodiversity (see below) should not be vigorously explored, supported and promoted, since these approaches are likely to be vital to securing a more sustainable food supply in the medium and long term. However, local

institutions currently have more direct influence upon consumption-based GHG emissions and as such they potentially present an opportunity, albeit a challenging one, for a short(er)-term intervention. Different approaches to reducing GHG emissions are not mutually exclusive. Ultimately, an effective response to UN SDG 12 will have to be wide ranging.

(ii) Food Waste

All four institutions have strong policy aims on food waste. While this is not an area explored in this study, waste does present an opportunity for local anchor institutions to share knowledge and good practice and explore the potential to work more closely together.

In London, the drive to a more sustainable public food procurement system focuses on consumption-based GHG emissions *and* managing waste more effectively (Malone et al 2021). The case study includes the development of innovative methods to reduce waste at each point in the supply chain, make effective use of surplus food and better management of waste food, which would warrant further study.

(iii) Biodiversity

In Leicestershire, the county council has investigated the viability of developing on-farm measures of biodiversity. The study assessed the impact of individual products on the biodiversity of the farmland where they were produced, as well as the carbon emissions associated with each product (Leicestershire County Council 2023).

The project revealed exciting possibilities for on farm/product measurement of biodiversity impacts, but also highlighted potential barriers to its implementation, particularly with respect to the cost to farmers (time and money).

It is notable that Leicestershire's interest in, and focus on, biodiversity has been driven by clear policy aims and objectives set out in the county's Net Zero Leicestershire Action Plan 2023-2027, Environment Strategy 2018-2030 and Space for Wildlife: Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland BAP 2016-2026

While biodiversity is also featured within the sustainability policies of the four Nottingham/shire institutions reviewed here, it is less explicitly linked to food procurement and farming, compared with Leicestershire. However, biodiversity clearly is important to Nottingham/shire institutions and features prominently in terms of managing land and promotion of local growing, among other activities, and so could provide an area for development.

3.3. Opportunities for Nottingham/shire: Economic Benefits

All four institutions in Nottingham/shire reviewed in this study share policy aims and objectives around supporting SME producers and suppliers and increasing the volume of food procured through them. In addition, at the workshop in July, there was agreement that increasing local, sustainable supply of food is an area in which the institutions could work together.

A review of the literature suggests that there are a number of opportunities for economic and social benefits from public food procurement (Molin et al 2021).

Economic benefits of public food procurement include market stimulation, increased job opportunities and the enhanced income that results (Molin et al 2021). In addition, local procurement can produce an economic multiplier effect within the local economy, which can

contribute to rural development (Kersley and Knuutila 2011). Economic benefits extend beyond farms and can ripple through food processing, packaging, logistics, retail, hospitality and the visitor economy (Goodwin-Hawkins 2020).

There have been many studies on the impact of local public food procurement for school meals. They have been largely based in the United States, where a Farm to School programme has been established since the 1990s and now includes over 40% of US school districts (reported in Becot et al, 2017). Economic multiplier effects are observed, but the impacts are sometimes described as ‘modest’ (Roche et al 2016, Becot et al 2017, Krasnof et al, 2023). Even so, they can still be very significant for local farms that benefit from a secure market, which is a strong basis from which to expand their business (Roche et al 2016).

However, beware the “local trap”: Local food production does not necessarily lead to more sustainability, particularly on environmental and social measures. Standards must be defined and applied to local, national and international supply (Goodwin-Hawkins 2020).

In addition, “local” needs to be defined within the Nottingham/shire food system. Local may feel like an intuitive concept, but it is complex to define and interpret within a procurement system. For example, a simple radius can have value in terms of framing marketing messages, but may arbitrarily exclude natural or efficient markets. If local procurement is to be meaningful, it must encompass an area in which a significant proportion of the institutional food needs can be met.

The ROBUST Project, an EU funded partnership that explores beneficial linkages between urban-rural areas, suggests a more nuanced approach to “local”, which incorporates geographical proximity, but also the length of supply chains, administrative boundaries, efficient and traditional markets, as well as underlying procurement values.

| Defining “Local” Food Procurement | |
|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Proximity | |
| Geographical Proximity | Presented as a % of food procured within a fixed radius – flexible and easy to communicate |
| Number of links in the supply chain | Aim for short supply chains (but not necessarily local) |
| Defined values underlying procurement | Environmental, economic and social values underpin the procurement framework |
| “New Localities” | |
| Fixed administrative boundaries | Presented as % of food procured within a fixed area – flexible and easy to communicate |
| Blurry boundaries. functional region around a city | Recognises and allows for the reality of markets, but also the availability of food. For example, Nottingham/shire could define its local market as the East Midlands, but that may include the East Midlands Combined |

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Relational between two points in a supply chain | <p>Authority area, plus Leicestershire, which is not included in the new regional body</p> <p>Can account for traditional/ best source e.g. Grimsby fish, or Lincolnshire veg and allow for travel times rather than distance, which may have larger effect on environmental impact</p> |
|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

ROBUST Project, compiled by Goodwin-Hawkins 2020

Despite the policy aim of engaging local food producers and suppliers in procurement, many large institutions find it hard to achieve this at scale. The Nottingham/shire institutions have had some successes, but they have all stated that there are significant barriers to small and medium size firms in becoming suppliers, which they are trying and eager to overcome. The table below summarises some benefits and barriers for SMEs.

| SME Engagement in Local Public Food Procurement | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Benefits | Barriers |
| <p>Local food system sales benefit farm employment and income and can generate a multiplier effect in the local economy</p> <p>In some instances, local procurement can provide a market for small sized/imperfect produce rejected by supermarkets</p> <p>Local public food procurement can provide a reliable market for small and medium size growers, which is a solid base from which to expand and diversify their business</p> <p>Close proximity of local growers can increase transparency in the supply chain and help to ensure environmental and ethical standards are met</p> <p>Social benefits can include embedding farmers into the community, increased social capital and giving children the opportunity to follow their food from farm to fork, potentially supporting healthier choices</p> | <p>Complex supply chain processes and accreditations may prevent small, medium size growers from engaging</p> <p>With respect to school food, strict school food standards with respect to ingredients (e.g. salt and sugar) and allergens</p> <p>The volume of food needed by the local institutions and the logistics of supplying a large number of sites</p> <p>Product range: Suppliers may be expected to provide a wider range of food than they can accommodate e.g. gluten free</p> <p>Supplying produce at a competitive price</p> <p>Mismatch between growing seasons and the school year for some seasonal produce</p> <p>Economic methodologies vary making comparisons among studies difficult</p> |

Roche et al 2016/ Goodwin-Hawkins 2020/ interviews undertaken with stakeholders

There are various options for supporting more local procurement of food. These include a dynamic food purchasing system, which was highly successful in Bath & North East Somerset, but is yet to be adopted in other areas; a new national dynamic purchasing system set up by DEFRA and the Crown Commercial Service, which launches later this year; a system built

around food hubs, which is being established in Birmingham, or wider adoption of an existing procurement system, like The Universities Catering Organisation (TUCO).

Nottingham/shire institutions have said they would like to investigate options to support more local procurement and extend the discussion to the potential supply of food banks, pantries and social supermarkets in the city. As a first step, institutions have expressed an interest in meeting each other and local suppliers.

Local institutions can also support direct sales from local producers to consumers, which is reflected in the policies of Nottingham City Council and Nottinghamshire County Council. An initiative in which a vegan café was established on campus has been trialled at the University of Nottingham. Events to promote local food may include, food festivals, marketing, and pop-up shops and restaurants.

3.4. Opportunities for Nottingham: Social Benefits

Social benefits of sustainable, local public food procurement are sometimes framed in terms of the health and wellbeing that is perceived to stem from nutritious, local, safe food and healthier choices (Molin et al 2021); the potential for more transparency with respect to farm management, which could include workers' rights or production methods (Schmitt 2017); highlighting heritage and enhancing culture and identity (Molin et al 2021), and revitalisation of rural areas (Stein and Santini 2020).

In a New Economics Foundation study of local food procurement by Nottinghamshire County Council, job security, employee wellbeing and the perception of food quality were all identified as social benefits of increasing local supply (Kersley and Knuutila 2011).

Furthermore, in other economic sectors such as the construction of the tram network, Nottingham City Council in particular, has used its procurement strategy to leverage significant social benefits in terms of employment and training for local people (Nottingham City Council Procurement Strategy 2018-2023).

Local public food procurement (and local growing schemes, including in schools) gives children the opportunity to engage with farmers and follow their food from farm to fork (e.g. Leicestershire case study)

In some cases, social benefits that can stem from sustainable, local procurement reinforce the delivery of other policy objectives:

For example, helping children to understand where and how food is grown may help to influence food choices. A recent study in the US concluded that a hands-on food education programme in primary school, which included cooking, resulted in sustained changes in dietary behaviour later in life (Pierre et al 2024).

Furthermore, interesting children in food is important to influencing their menu choices, which will be crucial to reducing consumption-based emissions in the short and long term (e.g. Birmingham case study; The Courgette Project (Wheeler 2023), and World Resources Institute).

Another example could be promoting a local food culture and enhancing local identity through food to contribute to economic development by encouraging sales of local food direct to consumers and supporting the visitor economy.

The quality and complexity of food labelling presents a significant challenge to sustainable procurement and OmniAction/Birmingham City Council's work to evaluate the reliability of labels with respect to nutritional density, fair and ethical trade, and animal welfare will be valuable once complete.

4. Our Roadmap to More Sustainable, Local Food Procurement in Nottingham/shire

Having studied the policy frameworks and activities of the four anchor institutions under review, and considering work in other areas, **we suggest a cooperative, policy-based approach to developing a more sustainable, local public food procurement system** in Nottingham/shire.

We found that policy approaches adopted elsewhere were often shaped by existing policy and widespread engagement of stakeholders, and believe that an effective approach would be to build upon what has been established by looking for common policy aims and objectives, which can be further developed, in unison, across institutions.

We have made some recommendations below in section 6 about where we think the four institutions' policy aims and objectives align, based on our observations. It may be a useful early task of the proposed Sustainable Procurement Working Group to consider these recommendations and decide if it agrees that these are profitable aims and objectives to explore together. By exploring shared aims and objectives, we think appropriate actions will (and are already) begin to emerge.

Roadmap to More Sustainable, Local Food Procurement in Nottingham/shire

- Institutions should explore their principal policy aims together: Where do they overlap? If they do, can the institutions work together to deliver those aims?
- **Is there an advantage/ benefit in working together? The potential benefit must be defined in order to justify the time and effort required to bring the institutions together**
- If there is a shared policy aim and a potential benefit in working together, then institutions should explore their policy objectives in relation to this aim. Do they align? Can they be harmonised? This activity should include all the stakeholders: caterers, growers and suppliers, policy officers, procurers, sustainability experts, etc. to set shared objectives, to ensure a whole-system approach
- What actions will be taken to deliver the policy objectives? What actions are different organisations already taking and can we share that learning? What has worked

elsewhere? [Institutions can have the same objectives, but don't necessarily have to share all the same actions e.g. one institution could seek to influence food choices through Menus of Change, while another may adopt activities proposed by the World Resources Institute]

- How are we going to measure progress towards these objectives? Can a common system of measurement be built around shared objectives, which all institutions can use so that the aggregate impact resulting from this collective effort can be monitored – and targets set?

5.Criteria for Successful Development of Sustainable, Local Food Procurement

We asked actors in food systems in other areas to identify the key elements of success when implementing changes to develop a more sustainable public food procurement system – advice across actors was remarkably similar. This is a summary of the key themes:

- **Clear policy aims and objectives backed by political commitment** must be the starting point, but policy does not have to limit ambition. Policy makers and food system actors can be and have proven to be opportunistic and agile. In a number of cases (e.g. Bath and North East Somerset, Leicestershire and Birmingham) they recognised and seized upon opportunities to rewrite policy and/or apply/enforce existing policy to develop or explore more sustainable, local public food procurement systems
- **Dynamic individuals working across departments are vital** in driving change, but they also create a potential single point of failure, which has resulted in a setback in some areas. A coordinating body that harnesses these essential, dynamic individual(s) may be more sustainable
- **Stakeholder engagement is key.** Engage with suppliers/producers, procurement officers, catering staff, parents, customers, school children as early as possible in the process of change
- **Take time to work through the issues** – allow time for participatory decision making - sustainable, local procurement and change are complex processes
- **Extensive/ongoing training is needed.** Training needs to include guidance on why the system is changing to give stakeholders purpose, as well as support on the technical requirements of the new system
- **Be clear about what you collectively want to achieve, what success looks like, how you measure it and set science-based targets.** The targets must link back to the policy objectives and their relevance be clear to stakeholders
- **Strike a balance between sustainability aims and what is feasible** for institutions. This balance may shift over time. Make it as easy as possible to participate/report. Consider new processes and structures

6. Recommendations for Next Steps: Short-term opportunities for Nottingham/shire Institutions to work together to enhance sustainable, local procurement

Policy objectives and associated actions highlighted in the table below - Environmental sustainability opportunities are in blue, Economic sustainability in green, and Social sustainability in yellow. Where short-term opportunities have been identified that could be pursued through the proposed **Sustainable Procurement Working Group (SPWG)**, within the City of Nottingham Sustainable Food Partnership, these have been listed under 'potential short term actions'.

These proposals are based upon judgements about whether procurement policy aims and objectives are already shared or aligned, as set out in the roadmap; the degree of local experience to build upon; the existence of workable examples from elsewhere, and the local appetite expressed in interviews and the workshop

Policy objectives and actions without any short term actions remain important opportunities associated with sustainable, local food procurement, which may have been allocated to other proposed working groups within the City of Nottingham Sustainable Food Partnership, or which do not present a clear short-term opportunity e.g. there may not yet be strong policy convergence. A number of areas require further exploration, e.g. diversity and equality.

In no way do the fonts, colours, or order indicate a hierarchy of value or importance of the policy objectives.

Summary of policy objectives, opportunities and potential actions

| Policy objective | Policy focus | Policy convergence | Opportunities | Potential short term actions |
|-----------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Reduce GHG emissions | On Farm | Weak | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agroecological/regenerative farming practices. Need agreed standards, based on reliable data and effective labels. | |
| | In Supply Chain | Strong | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Includes storing, processing, packaging and transport of food Opportunities for shared learning locally and around the county e.g. Birmingham, which cut the number of deliveries from 42,000 to 15,000 as a result of more efficient supply routes (Birmingham City Council Cabinet 2023). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use SPWG to explore shared policy aim and assess benefit of working together to create more efficient supply chains e.g. procurement from local suppliers for some fresh produce |
| | Through consumption | Some | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All institutions reference consumption/food choices in policy documents but those aspirations are more strongly expressed in the universities Consumption provides an opportunity to drive very significant reductions in carbon emissions e.g. London & Leicestershire case studies UoN has tested various interventions and successfully influenced food choices among students, creating opportunities for shared learning | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use SPWG to explore shared policy aim and assess benefit of working together to influence consumption |
| | By reducing waste | Strong | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential opportunities for shared learning/action | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use SPWG to explore shared policy aim and assess benefit of working together to influence waste management |

| | | | | |
|------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Increase biodiversity | Safeguard biodiversity in food production | Weak | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need agreed standards, based on reliable data and effective labels | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use SPWG to access OmniAction/ Birmingham City Council food labelling toolkit |
| | Benchmark and Measure Biodiversity | Weak | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Benchmarking in order to enhance biodiversity linked to individual products. See Leicestershire case study. New tools becoming available. E.g. Trinity Agtech's Sandy tool. Not currently a strong focus in Nottingham/shire policy | |
| | Use public sector food spend to shift local agriculture towards agroecological methods | Weak | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would need to agree standards, set benchmarks and targets. Requires mechanism of measuring and reporting. Not currently a strong focus in Nottingham/shire policy | |
| Support local SMEs | Facilitate/support direct sales to consumers | Some | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Both councils have policy commitments to promote the sale of local, healthy food direct to consumers e.g. in the visitor economy and through 'Healthy Zones'; University of Nottingham has experience of supporting a local food retail business on campus <i>Complements local procurement and enhancing culture and identity through local food, below</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use SPWG to explore shared policy aim and assess benefit of working together to facilitate local SMEs selling directly to consumers |
| | Institutions buy more food from local SMEs | Strong | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The shared policy aim and benefits of working together were initially explored at the workshop: Institutions expressed interest in exploring opportunities further and potentially developing a shared local supplier list Potential for some form of dynamic purchasing, or elements of that approach e.g. Bath & North East Somerset case study; Crown Commercial | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use SPWG to host discussion on aligning some objectives and identifying actions around local procurement, including exploring the "local" geographical footprint, as well as evaluating different options to establish a dynamic approach |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------------------------|--------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | | Service: Buying Better Food and Drink, or use of food hubs e.g. Birmingham case study | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organise a local 'meet the suppliers' event; explore funding opportunities through the Rural Development Fund |
| | Facilitate/support new entrants to agriculture | Some | FarmStart Feasibility Study. This is included within the proposed Future Farmers and the Food Workforce Working Group within the City of Nottingham Sustainable Food Partnership | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use SPWG to evaluate different procurement options in terms of cost |
| | Reduce costs of PFP procurement | - | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All institutions are managing increased costs of food and local authorities, in particular, describe significant financial pressures, as a result there is interest in finding procurement options that promote sustainability and value for money This was achieved in Bath & North East Somerset, where the council reduced its food procurement costs through menu redesign; more efficient delivery routes/ procurement methods and economies of scale, while increasing the number of local producers/suppliers | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use SPWG to evaluate different procurement options in terms of cost |
| Health and Wellbeing | Nutritional density | Strong | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> While the institutions reviewed here do not necessarily use the phrase 'nutritional density' in their policies, there is a widespread commitment to providing good quality, nutritious food OmniAction and the Birmingham Sustainable Food Partnership have placed nutritional density at the heart of their sustainable food standards – reports due out in 24/25 which may provide an opportunity to build on this work | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use SPWG to explore the concept of nutritional density in the Nottingham/shire food system e.g. in procurement for food pantries/social supermarkets in areas of high food insecurity |

| | | | | |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | Increase attractive healthy, sustainable, options on menus | Some | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local, national and international experience of making healthy, sustainable food appealing e.g. London, Birmingham, B&NES case studies; The Courgette Project; University of Nottingham Menus of Change initiative and supporting actions, and the Coolfood Pledge. <i>Complements cutting emissions through shifting consumption, above</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify shared learning through the SPWG, potentially supporting a shared commitment to cutting emissions through changes in consumption |
| | Engage children, students, staff in growing, local food and healthy eating | Some | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Both councils share policy aims around enhancing local growing. Case studies e.g. Birmingham and Leicestershire support the idea that growing, access to local food and exposure to new foods is important in developing children's attitudes to food and influencing choices This objective is included within the proposed Cultivating Young People Working Group and Grow and Eat Working Group within the City of Nottingham Sustainable Food Partnership <i>Complements cutting emissions through shifting consumption above</i> | |
| Culture & Identity | Enhance local identity through food; create a good food culture | Some | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Both councils highlight the value of local food in shaping culture and identity (place), which may support healthy food choices and economic development. Activities may include food festivals, pop up shops, grow and eat activities or farm visits Using food to reinforce a sense of place may be beneficial to the universities This objective is referenced in the proposed Grow and Eat Working Group of the City of Nottingham Sustainable Food Partnership | |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Fair & Ethical Trade | Securing livelihoods and decent jobs | Strong | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Universities have access to detailed product evaluations through TUCO – opportunity for shared learning through SPWG | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use SPWG to engage OmniAction about its evaluation of labelling schemes to guide procurement decisions and for the universities to share their experience of TUCO |
| | Tackling modern slavery | Some | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> More exploration required | |
| | Diversity and equality | Strong | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> More exploration required | |
| | Respecting land sovereignty | Some | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> More exploration required | |
| Animal Welfare | Safeguarding animal health and welfare e.g. housing, transport, feed | Some | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> More exploration required | |

7. Conclusion

There is excellent work underway at all four anchor institutions reviewed for this study, with respect to sustainable, local public food procurement, which delivers environmental, economic and social benefits.

All four institutions have extensive – and sometimes developing - policy in relation to procurement and food set out in their own plans. While there is a lot of overlap between the policies, the individual institutions have their own focus on particular aims and objectives.

In this project, we are proposing that **where these aims and objectives converge in both policy and practice is where there will be the best opportunity**, at least in the short term, to work together to create a more sustainable, local food procurement system.

In addition, there is valuable experience in sustainable, local food procurement within other areas and these case studies can be used to guide actions in Nottingham/shire.

We propose that work to deliver more sustainable, local public food procurement in Nottingham/shire be undertaken within the proposed **Sustainable Procurement Working Group** of the City of Nottingham Sustainable Food Partnership

This study has focused on the policy and actions of Nottingham City Council, Nottinghamshire County Council, University of Nottingham and Nottingham Trent University. However, this group could be extended to include other local institutions, such as the NHS and further education colleges as well as the private sector. In addition, “local” could be conceived in a multi-county or regional context.

This report is a summary of a more detailed document which will be provided to members of the proposed Sustainable Procurement Working Group of the City of Nottingham Sustainable Food Partnership, when the SFP is launched later this year, and made available to the public, project partners, workshop attendees, and interviewees through the University of Nottingham’s repositories. It can also be requested at any time following its publication by emailing stacia.stetkiewicz@nottingham.ac.uk

8. Bibliography

Attwood, S., Voorheis, P., Mercer, C., Davies, K., and Vennard, D. 2024. Playbook for guiding diners toward plant-rich dishes in food service. World Resources Institute. Online 2024. chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://files.wri.org/d8/s3fs-public/19_Report_Playbook_Plant-Rich_Diets_final.pdf

Birmingham City Council Cabinet. 2023. Catering and Food Procurement Strategy for Cityserve/Civic Catering. Online. June 27, 2023. Decision: 011395/2023. Available at: https://birmingham.cmis.uk.com/birmingham/Decisions/tabid/67/ctl/ViewCMIS_DecisionDetails/mid/391/Id/11395/Default.aspx (Accessed on July 21, 2023)

Becot, F., Kolodinsky, J. M., Roche, E., Zipparo, A. E., Berlin, L., Buckwalter, E., & McLaughlin, J. 2017. Do Farm-to-School Programs Create Local Economic Impacts? *Choices*, 32(1), 1–8. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/90014634>

Beriss, D. (2019). Food: Location, location, location. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 48: 61-75. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-anthro-102317-050249>

Buccheri, R. 2024. FWD shares concerns over Buying Better Food Framework contract award. *The Grocer*. Online. February 26, 2024. Available at: <https://www.thegrocer.co.uk/wholesalers/fwd-shares-concerns-over-buying-better-food-framework-contract-award/688623.article>

Cairns, L. 2022. Rethinking Public Procurement of Food. Online. University of Exeter. September 4, 2022. Available at chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/file:///C:/Users/hsmit/Downloads/Rethinking%20Public%20Procurement%20of%20Food%20(1).pdf (Accessed on July 21, 2024)

CarbonCloud. Beef (average) benchmark (UK). Available at <https://apps.carboncloud.com/climatehub/product-reports/id/121634410188> (Accessed on July 21, 2024)

Cerutti A, Contu S, Ardente F, Donno D, Beccaro G. Carbon Footprint in Green Public Procurement: policy evaluation from a case study in the food sector. *FOOD POLICY* 58; 2016. p. 82-93. JRC95435

Crippa, M., Solazzo, E., Guizzardi, D., Monforti-Ferrario, F., Tubiello, F. N., & Leip, A. (2021). Food systems are responsible for a third of global anthropogenic GHG emissions. *Nature Food*, 2(3), 198–209. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43016-021-00225-9>

Crown Commercial Service. 2024. Buying Better Food and Drink. Available at: <https://www.contractsfinder.service.gov.uk/Notice/d6ffa5f7-f3b2-4608-a85b-b8777d04c913>

Crown Commercial Service. 2024. Dynamic Purchasing Systems. Available at [https://www.crowncommercial.gov.uk/information-for-buyers-and-suppliers/start-buying-commercial-agreements/dynamic-purchasing-systems-dps#:~:text=A%20Dynamic%20Purchasing%20System%20\(DPS\)%20is%20a%20type%20of%20commercial,time%20during%20the%20agreement's%20life.](https://www.crowncommercial.gov.uk/information-for-buyers-and-suppliers/start-buying-commercial-agreements/dynamic-purchasing-systems-dps#:~:text=A%20Dynamic%20Purchasing%20System%20(DPS)%20is%20a%20type%20of%20commercial,time%20during%20the%20agreement's%20life.)

Crown Commercial Service, 2024. What is the Buying Better Food and Drink agreement? Available at: chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/<https://assets.crowncommercial.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/RM6279-Buying-Better-Food-Supplier-FAQ-V1.pdf>

De Laurentiis, V.; Hunt, D.V.L.; Lee, S.E.; Rogers, C.D.F. 2018. EATS: A life cycle-based decision support tool for local authorities and school caterers. *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.* 2018, 24, 1222–1238

Dimbleby, H. 2021. The National Food Strategy: The Plan. 2021. P.161. Available at <https://www.nationalfoodstrategy.org/>

Sodexo. 2024. Entegra named as the supplier on Crown Commercial Service's Buying Better Food and Drink public sector agreement. Online February 22, 2024. <https://uk.sodexo.com/home/media/news-room/newsList-area/uk-press-releases/entegra-ccs-buying-better-ccs.html>

FAO, Alliance of Biodiversity International and CIAT and Editora da UFRGS. 2021. Public food procurement for sustainable food systems and healthy diets – Volume 1. Rome.
<https://doi.org/10.4060/cb7960en>

Goodwin-Hawkins, B., Arcuri, S., Bauchinger, L., Heley, J., Keech, D., Matthew Reed, R., and Woods, M. 2020. How Local is Local? Rethinking local food and the public plate in Monmouthshire, Wales. ROBUST. Available at chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://www.monmouthshire.gov.uk/app/uploads/2020/11/How-Local-Is-Local_MCC_OCT2020_final.pdf (Accessed on July 21, 2024)

Goodwin-Hawkins, B., Barclay, L., Berry, R., Reindl, G. and Dent, B. 2023. Bringing the Marches Dynamic Food Procurement System (DFPS) to life. National Innovation entre: Rural Enterprise. 2023. Available at: chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://www.sustainweb.org/assets/marchesdfps_executive-summary_final-Jul23.pdf

Great Britain 2022. Business Register and Employment Survey 2022. Office for National Statistics. Search available via NOMIS:
<https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/query/construct/summary.asp?mode=construct&version=0&dataset=189> (Accessed on July 22, 2024)

Hancock, L. 2024. What is biodiversity? Online. 2024. World Wildlife Fund. Available at <https://www.worldwildlife.org/pages/what-is-biodiversity#:~:text=Biodiversity%20is%20all%20the%20different,make%20up%20our%20natural%20world>. (Accessed on July 22, 2024)

[Harris, F.](#) 2009. Perspectives on educational visits to farms: a report on research with farmers, teachers, children and parents. (Project Report) Kingston upon Thames, U.K.: Kingston University. 34 p. (Unpublished)

Howroyd, R. 2017. Food and Catering: Provision of School Food in Bath. Online. SPP Regions. Regional Networks for Sustainable Procurement. Available at chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/<https://assets.crowncommercial.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/Feedback-for-BANES-pilot-Food-Model-contract.docx-1.pdf> (Accessed on July 21, 2024)

Kersley, H and Knuutila, A. 2011. The Benefits of Procuring School Meals Through the Food For Life Partnership. New Economics Foundation. 2011. Available at <https://neweconomics.org/2011/05/benefits-procuring-school-meals-food-life-partnership> (Accessed on July 22, 2024)

Kneafsey M, Venn L, Schmutz U, Balasz B, Trenchard L, Eyden-Wood T, Bos E, Sutton G, Blackett M, authors Santini F, Gomez Y Paloma S, editors. Short Food Supply Chains and Local Food Systems in the EU. A State of Play of their Socio-Economic Characteristics. EUR 25911. Luxembourg (Luxembourg): Publications Office of the European Union; 2013. JRC80420

Krasnoff, S.M., Todd M. Schmit, T.M., and Bilinski, C.B. 2023. Economic impact assessment of public incentives to support farm-to-school food purchases, Food Policy, Volume 121, 2023, 102545, ISSN 0306-9192, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodpol.2023.102545>.
(<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0306919223001434>)

Leicestershire County Council. 2023. Good Food Leicestershire Regenerative Produce Report. Online. September 2023. Leicestershire County Council. Available at chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://resources.leicestershire.gov.uk/sites/resource/files/2024-03/Leicestershire-regenerative-produce-report.pdf (Accessed on July 21, 2023)

MacDiarmid JI. Seasonality and dietary requirements: will eating seasonal food contribute to health and environmental sustainability? *Proceedings of the Nutrition Society*. 2014;73(3):368-375. doi:10.1017/S0029665113003753

Malone, S., Billant, J., and Metivier, P. 2021. London's food footprint: An analysis of material flows, consumption-based emissions and levers for climate action. Online. ReLondon. November 2021. Available at chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://ek45a9hw9ht.exactdn.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/ReLondon_Londons_food_footprint_online.pdf (Accessed July 21, 2024)

Menus of Change. 2024. Menus of Change: The Business of Healthy Sustainable Delicious Food Choices. Culinary Institute of America and Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health. Available at <https://www.menusofchange.org/> (Accessed on July 21, 2024)

Molin, E.; Martin, M.; Björklund, A. Addressing Sustainability within Public Procurement of Food: A Systematic Literature Review. *Sustainability* 2021, 13, 13395 . <https://doi.org/10.3390/su132313395>

NFU. 2022. Breaking Down Food Procurement Barriers. Online. NFU. April 5, 2022. <https://www.nfuonline.com/updates-and-information/breaking-down-procurement-barriers/> (Accessed on July 22, 2024)

Nottingham City Council. 2020. Carbon Neutral Nottingham 2020-2028 Action Plan. Online. Available at chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://www.nottinghamcity.gov.uk/media/rtdli3vq/2028-carbon-neutral-action-plan-v2-160620.pdf (Accessed on July 21, 2024)

Nottinghamshire County Council. 2024. Nottinghamshire Net-Zero Framework 2024. Online. Available at chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://www.nottinghamshire.gov.uk/DMS/Document.ashx?czJKcaeAi5tUFL1DTL2UE4zNRBcoShgo=ncmFhRW3Ytk7ibIMmEzlwubm9X6XGp9%2bmEltgpM7gnQ6S%2fKNdxA0%2bA%3d%3d&rUzWRPf%2bZ3zd4E7lkn8Lyw%3d%3d=pwRE6AGJFLDNIh225F5QMaQWCtPHwdhUfCZ%2fLUQzgA2uL5jNRG4jdQ%3d%3d&mCTIbCubSFfXsDGW9IXnlg%3d%3d=hFfIUdN3100%3d&kCx1AnS9%2fpWZQ40DXFvdEw%3d%3d=hFfIUdN3100%3d&uJovDxwdjMPoYv%2bAJvYtyA%3d%3d=ctNJFf55vVA%3d&FgPIIEJYlotS%2bYGoBi5oIA%3d%3d=NHdURQburHA%3d&d9Qjj0ag1Pd993jsyOJqFvmyB7X0CSQK=ctNJFf55vVA%3d&WGewmoAfeNR9xqBux0r1Q8Za60lavYmz=ctNJFf55vVA%3d&WGewmoAfeNQ16B2MHuCpMRKZMwaG1PaO=ctNJFf55vVA%3d (Accessed on July 21, 2024)

Nottinghamshire County Council. 2024. School Meals: Common Questions, Our Ingredients. Available at <https://www.nottinghamshire.gov.uk/education/school-meals/common-questions> (Accessed on July 22, 2024)

Pierre, C.S., Sokalsky, A., Sacke, J.M., 2024. Participant Perspectives on the Impact of a School-Based, Experiential Food Education Program Across Childhood, Adolescence, and

Young Adulthood. *Journal of Nutrition Education and Behaviour* 56, 4–15.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneb.2023.10.012>

Ranke, T.D.; Mitchell, C.L.; George, D.M.S.; D’Adamo, C.R. Evaluation of the Balanced Menus Challenge: A healthy food and sustainability programme in hospitals in Maryland. *Public Health Nutr.* 2015, 18, 2341–2349

Reisch, L., Eberle, U., & Lorek, S. 2013. Sustainable food consumption: an overview of contemporary issues and policies. *Sustainability: Science, Practice and Policy*, 9(2), 7–25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15487733.2013.11908111>

Roche, E., Becot, F., Kolodinsky, J. and Conner, D. 2016. Economic contribution and potential impact of local food purchases made by Vermont schools, Center for Rural Studies, University of Vermont (2016)

https://agriculture.vermont.gov/sites/agriculture/files/documents/Farm_to_School_Institution/Economic%20Contribution%20of%20Farm%20to%20School%20in%20Vermont%20.pdf

Schmitt, E., Galli, F., Menozzi, D., Maye, D., Touzard, J-M., Marescotti, A., Six, J., and Brunori, G. Comparing the sustainability of local and global food products in Europe, *Journal of Cleaner Production*, Volume 165, 2017, Pages 346-359, ISSN 0959-6526, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.07.039>.

(<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0959652617314671>)

Smart, A. 2018. Looking back at the 130-year history of Nottingham’s cattle market. *Nottingham Post*. Online. November 5, 2018. <https://www.nottinghampost.com/news/history/looking-back-130-year-history-2185021> (Accessed on July 22, 2024)

Stein, A.J., Santini, F. 2022. The sustainability of “local” food: a review for policy-makers. *Rev Agric Food Environ Stud* 103, 77–89 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41130-021-00148-w>

Trading Economics. 2024. United Kingdom - Employment In Agriculture (% Of Total Employment). Available at <https://tradingeconomics.com/united-kingdom/employment-in-agriculture-percent-of-total-employment-wb-data.html>

United Nations. Sustainable Development Goals. Goal12: Ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns. *UN Sustainable Development Goals*. Online. Available at <https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/sustainable-consumption-production/> (Accessed July 21, 2024)

United Nations. 2015. Transforming our world: the 2030 agenda for sustainable development. Online. https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/21252030%20Agenda%20for%20Sustainable%20Development%20web.pdf?_gl=1*y4wwlr*_ga*NzczMzk0MTE0LjE3MTc2NjI5ODc.*_ga_TK9BQL5X7Z*MTcxNzY2MzA1OS4xLjEuMTcxNzY2NDY4MS4wLjAuMA (Accessed July 21, 2024)

UNSDG. 2022. The 5Ps of the SDGs: People, Planet, Prosperity, Peace and Partnership. Online. March 11, 2022. Available at <https://unsdg.un.org/latest/videos/5ps-sdgs-people-planet-prosperity-peace-and-partnership> (Accessed July 21, 2024).

Wheeler, A. 2023. The Courgette Pilot: Agroecological Welsh Veg for Primary Schools in Wales. January 2023. Cardiff & Vale Health Charity/Food Cardiff. Available at: chrome-

extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://www.foodsensewales.org.uk/app/uploads/2023/01/CourgetteReport_Eng.pdf

Wilkinson, T., Nye, C., Lobley, M., Clappison, A., Goodwin, A., Hilton, J., West, H., Thompson, S., MacQueen, G., and Foggarty, M. 2022. Public Procurement of Food in the South West Region: opportunities and barriers to relocating food supply. Available at chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://www.exeter.ac.uk/v8media/research/crpr/documents/Public_Procurement_of_Food_in_the_South_West.pdf (Accessed on July 21 2024)

Willett, W., Rockström, J., Loken, B., Springmann, M., Lang, T., Vermeulen, S., Garnett, T. et al. 2019. Food in the Anthropocene: the EAT-Lancet Commission on healthy diets from sustainable food systems. *Lancet*, 393: 447–492

World Resources Institute. 2024. Coolfood Pledge. Available at <https://www.wri.org/initiatives/cool-food-pledge>