UN Inter-Agency Task Force on Social and Solidarity Economy

Building Sustainable Local Food Solutions

How Canadian Indigenous Communities are Using the Social and Solidarity Economy to Implement Zero Hunger

Jennifer Sumner
University of Toronto
Canada

M. Derya Tarhan
University of Toronto
Canada

J. J. McMurtry
York University
Canada

May 6, 2019

Abstract

In the face of chronic food insecurity brought on by centuries of colonialism, some Indigenous communities in Canada are turning to the social and solidarity economy to craft their own solutions to hunger. This paper explores these solutions, using a case study of the Northern Manitoba Food, Culture and Community Collaborative (NMFCCC) to illustrate how they are helping to implement the second Sustainable Development Goal – zero hunger. Through local initiatives such as community gardens and greenhouses, co-operatives, community kitchens, school gardens, community-based food programs, food markets and public-sector procurement, they are also helping to implement other Sustainable Development Goals, while providing models that can be replicated in diverse communities. The emphasis on community ownership, control and benefits highlights the importance of a definition of the SSE that is based on community needs.

Keywords

Bio

Jennifer Sumner is a Lecturer in the Adult Education and Community Development Program of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at the University of Toronto. Her main research interests focus on food and food systems, sustainability, the social economy and rural communities, and she is co-editor of *Critical Perspectives in Food Studies* (2nd edition), 2017, Oxford University Press.

M. Derya Tarhan is a PhD Candidate in Adult Education and Community Development at Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) of the University of Toronto. His research interests include energy systems, the social economy, democratic theory, and community development.

J. J. McMurtry is an Associate Professor in the Business and Society Program at York University, and is currently serving as Interim Dean of the Faculty of Liberal Arts and Professional Studies. His research focuses on Alternative Economics in both theory and practice, and he has written recently on community-owned energy and the theory and practice of the social economy and social enterprise in Canada and globally.

Introduction

The 2030 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) are promoted by the United Nations as a "plan of action for people, planet and prosperity," representing a global attempt to "shift the world onto a sustainable and resilient path" (UN nd, 5). The second SDG is zero hunger, which encourages people to end hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition, and promote sustainable agriculture.

One of the means for implementing this SDG and achieving zero hunger is the social and solidarity economy (SSE), which has been understood as "the production of goods and services by a broad range of organizations and enterprises that have explicit social and often environmental objectives, and are guided by principles and practices of cooperation, solidarity, ethics and democratic self-management" (TFSSE 2014, iv). Although the origins of the social and solidarity economy date long before the period of industrialization or the modern state (Shragge and Fontan 2000), many turn to it today in their search for sustainability (Sumner 2007), including Indigenous people (Wuttunee 2010; Sengupta, Vieta and McMurtry 2015).

Indigenous people in Canada have long faced social, economic and environmental discrimination, as well as being victims of cultural genocide (TRC 2015). However, media, academic and popular attention has largely remained on developing a general (often paternalistic and bureaucratically focused) awareness of these problems rather than investigating actually existing solutions. This is particularly true in terms of food – the current food system in many Indigenous communities is still controlled by policies and practices rooted in the colonial mentality of the Indian Act. The astronomical cost of fresh and nutritious food and the negative results of the 'nutrition transition' to nutritionally compromised industrial food in Indigenous communities have been identified as problems in some quarters, but not the collective solutions community residents have devised to overcome these challenges.

This paper proposes to address this gap by focusing on the role of the social and solidarity economy as a means to implement zero hunger, the second SDG, through place-based, community-led sustainable food solutions offered by emerging and existing Indigenous social economy organizations and social enterprises in Canada. The paper will begin by outlining the social and solidarity economy and its relationship to food and to Indigenous communities. Using the findings of a three-stage internet search, it will then describe food-related initiatives in the SSE in Canadian Indigenous communities through a case study of the Northern Manitoba Food, Culture and Community Collaborative (NMFCCC). Finally, it will discuss how these communities are turning to the SSE to end hunger, all the while aiming for food security and improved nutrition for historically marginalized Indigenous communities, and promoting local, responsible and sustainable agriculture through community gardens and greenhouses, co-operatives, community kitchens, school gardens, community-based food programs, food markets and public-sector procurement. At the same time, these SSE initiatives have the potential to address other SDGs, such as good health and well-being (SDG 3), quality education (SDG 4) and decent work and economic growth (SDG 8). In all of these examples, Indigenous communities are demanding that they have a central role in developing solutions to the food crisis.

The Social and Solidarity Economy and Food

An umbrella term, the social and solidarity economy has been defined by Utting (2015, 2) as "forms of economic activity that prioritise social and often environmental objectives, and involve producers, workers, consumers and citizens acting collectively and in solidarity." For Utting, the SSE involves the social economy as well as self-help groups that produce goods and services, solidarity purchasing such as fair trade networks, consumer groups that engage in collective provisioning, informal-economy workers' associations, new types of profit-oriented social enterprises and entrepreneurs, income-generating NGOs, forms of solidarity finance, and the collaborative economy, including digital crowdfunding and sharing schemes. Unlike the neoliberal economy, the SSE has the ability to deliver an enormous range of goods and services

to not only those who can afford them, but also those who cannot. But does the SSE deliver on this promise? In particular, can it deliver in terms of food?

Food is central to considerations of the SSE because of its importance as a life good and a human right. More than just a commodity, food can be understood as a total social fact (Mauss 1967) that encompasses all facets of human existence. Food co-operatives, food recovery programs, urban agriculture, buying clubs, community-supported agriculture and fisheries, soup kitchens, social food procurement, alternative food initiatives, marketing boards, food banks, and community kitchens, greenhouses and gardens are just some examples of the potential interface between food and the SSE. Initiatives like these can use the SSE to move food from producers to consumers, particularly those in need, sometimes bypassing the conventional market completely. As such, they set a precedent for a shift that sees food less as a commodity and more as a basic human right.

The Sustainable Development Goals, Food and the Social and Solidarity Economy

The Sustainable Development Goals represent "a new coherent way of thinking about how issues as diverse as poverty, education and climate change fit together; it entwines economic, social and environmental targets in 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) as an 'indivisible whole'" (Nilsson, Griggs and Visbeck 2016). The second sustainable development goal – zero hunger – is the focus of this paper. While entwined with all the rest of the SDGs, this goal hones in on ending hunger, achieving food security and improved nutrition, and promoting sustainable agriculture. Given its ability to deliver goods and services to marginalized populations, can the SSE help to implement this SDG? This paper will study a range of sustainable local food initiatives in Indigenous communities in Canada to ascertain whether these forms of the SSE can be a means of implementation for the SDGs.

Indigenous Communities in Canada

In Canada, Indigenous people include First Nations, Inuit and Metis. While they comprise only 4.3 percent of the population, they are the fastest-growing demographic group in the country (Statistics Canada 2011; 2015). More than 600 Indigenous communities are spread across Canada, "each with unique relationships to three components: the land; municipal, provincial, and federal governments; and non-Indigenous communities" (Sengupta, Vieta and McMurtry 2015, 105).

For well over a century, the goals of Canada's policy regarding Indigenous people included eliminating their governments, ignoring their rights, terminating the treaties made with them, and causing them to cease to exist through processes of assimilation, such as forcing children into residential schools, which has been described as cultural genocide (TRC 2015). One of the many negative legacies of a long history political and economic marginalization is the deep and severe food insecurity faced by Indigenous people living both on- and off-reserve in remote and urban areas, with many of them experiencing considerably lower levels of access to adequate food compared to the general population (de Schutter 2012). At the same time, however, they are also "uniquely positioned with respect to food by virtue of their relationship with traditional lands and the natural resources therein, which is a central component of their identity" (9). As a result, the UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food, Olivier de Schutter (2012, 10), believes that

> continued and concerted measures are needed to develop new initiatives and reform existing ones, in consultation and in real partnership with indigenous peoples with the goal of strengthening indigenous peoples' own self-determination and decision-making over their affairs at all levels.

Such initiatives are springing up across the country, many of them embedded in the SSE and run by Indigenous communities.

The SSE and Indigenous Communities in Canada

Sengupta et al. (2015) maintain that, in Canada, Indigenous businesses make up a distinct type of social enterprise, which is led and managed by Indigenous communities. They point out that Indigenous social enterprise has a complex historical context, with the precursors of current Indigenous SSE initiatives being implemented by non-Indigenous settlers and having neither a benign nor positive effect on Indigenous communities, reflecting the broader realities of colonization. Today, the factors that influence SSE development in Indigenous communities include "the ability to convert different types of capital – including land, human, social, environmental, cultural, and financial capital – to meet holistic requirements of diverse Indigenous communities" (119), resulting in organizations with quadruple bottom line indicators: economic, social, environmental and cultural.

In her work on the social economy in Canada, Wuttunee (2010, 210) emphasized that the Indigenous community is grappling with the term 'social economy':

> The presumption must be that the social economy label is a term that comes from outside a given community – and as such may or may not fit with the terminology used by that community for naming its experience, even though many aspects of what is labelled by the concept describes centuries-old Aboriginal practice.

After posing critical questions about the concept, Wuttunee (2010) goes on to give two reasons why the social economy has become an effective tool of community development: it allows for a range of forms and maintains control in the hands of Indigenous communities. The same can be said of the SSE, a non-Indigenous concept being applied to Indigenous practices. Many Indigenous communities in Canada have chosen to participate in the SSE and have a great deal to teach non-Indigenous practitioners, policy makers and academics about conceptualization of the SSE. We now turn to some of these initiatives.

The Research Project

Funded by an institutional grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, this research project assembled a data base of sustainable local food initiatives in Indigenous communities in Canada using public knowledge on the Internet and a range of both popular and academic publications. To date, it has identified 166 initiatives, most of which fit within the definition of the SSE: community gardens and greenhouses (58), co-operatives (42), school gardens (17), food markets (9), community-based food programs (9), advocacy and support (7), harvesting and hunting initiatives (5), education and training (5), institutional food (4), community kitchens (2), procurement initiatives (2) and single initiatives involving food aid, a food bank, a food distribution centre, a combined food market/community garden/greenhouse, a harvesting and a hunting initiative based on food aid, and institutional procurement.

These findings suggest several trends. The initiatives are place-based and respond to local problems. They are also predominantly led by Indigenous communities and supported by other organizations. There is a recent surge in the number of community gardens, and many of the other initiatives are co-operatives. In addition, hospitals and universities are becoming involved with traditional foods. And, finally, certain types of initiatives show high levels of geographic concentration in some parts of Canada.

The majority of these sustainable local food initiatives – particularly community gardens/greenhouses and co-operatives – fall directly into the category of SSE. The community gardens and greenhouses are examples of community enterprise and service provisioning, while the co-operatives are more formal organizations that fall under the auspices of Co-operatives

and Mutuals Canada, a national umbrella organization with 21 million member-owners, $527B in assets, $74.4B in revenues and 207,000 jobs (Coop Canada 2018). Our case study follows this trend – the Northern Manitoba Food, Culture and Community Collaborative (NMFCCC) highlights community gardens, greenhouses and co-operatives.

Case Study: The Northern Manitoba Food, Culture and Community Collaborative

A program under the auspices of Tides Canada, The Northern Manitoba Food, Culture and Community Collaborative (NMFCCC) is a not-for-profit organization providing financial and technical support to Indigenous-led food initiatives in northern Manitoba. As a self-described interconnected group of people, communities, organizations and governments, it began as a pilot project in 2013 and became fully realized in 2014 (NMFCCC 2017). Its overall goal is to increase food security and economic development (Glass 2016). In essence, the NMFCCC is an innovative collaborative made up of northern community people, northern advisors, funders and organizations who work together to foster healthier and stronger communities in Northern Manitoba, through improved access to healthy foods and the development of resilient local economies (NMFCCC nd).

The NMFCCC operates within a larger context of widespread food insecurity in Northern Manitoba. A report from 2013 that looked at 14 communities found 75% of households were struggling with food insecurity, which is eight times higher than the national average (McDougall 2016). Such high levels of food insecurity have "hastened the need for innovative community-based food initiatives for remote communities in Northern Manitoba," with a focus on "improved access to healthy foods" (8). While previous attempts worked in silos and in particular communities, the NMFCCC is a strategic collaboration that not only supports local solutions, but also pools money and resources of like-minded organizations, is advised and guided by northern Manitobans, supports communities to develop locally-derived solutions, works relationally, and aims for deep and intentional shared learning (ibid.). In particular, its relational approach differs from the traditional philanthropic model in that it entails being open to listening, learning and the possibility of personal transformation through the relationship. Its recent report (NMFCCC 2017) highlights 20 food-related projects, including 11 horticulture projects, four livestock and beekeeping projects, and four projects focused on northern traditional foods and teachings. The projects include three school gardens, four community gardens, one community greenhouse, a hub for training and research on northern boreal food production, a food producers' co-op, a chicken project two beekeeping projects, and a farm. In line with the second SDG, the objectives of these projects include increasing food security, improving food access, improving vegetable and fruit yields in the community, establishing knowledge of healthy living, making the garden sustainable, sharing food, promoting healthy eating habits, supporting community members in starting their own gardens and greenhouses, and increasing access to affordable and local grown organic food options. In terms of sustainable agriculture, some of the projects aim for sustainable gardens, safe and sustainable food systems, and organic production. The Peguis Community Garden Project under the leadership of Elder Carl McCorrister encapsulates the spirit of the second SDG by stating that its objective is to "regain our heritage and culture of community agriculture by engaging community members to grow their own healthy foods, in the hope that their children will continue this cultural activity and provide food security for all" (NMFCCC 2017, 27).

These SSE projects do have some problems (see Table 1), but they are understood not as failures, but as challenges for the community to work through to become collectively stronger and to learn from through a solutions approach.

Table 1. Problems Reported with SSE Projects	
Water problems	Distant water sources Flooding Problems with water supply Too much rain, which delayed planting Lack of rain Watering had to be done by hand
Staff/volunteer problems	Reduced staffing Difficulty getting people to participate Aging population, so hard to get people involved Not enough positions for all the youth interested in working in the garden No tradition of gardening, so hard to get community momentum People feeling shy and insecure about their gardening knowledge
Soil/land problems	Poor soil Finding land for the garden
Technology problems	Challenges regulating the temperature of the greenhouse Challenges with the clay oven and the wood cook stove
Weather/climate problems	Late start to the gardening season because of a slow spring Short growing season Need to adapt seeds to a cold climate Very hot summer Forest fire and community evacuation
Animal problems	Animals dug up vegetables in gardens Animal feed is expensive Lack of adequate shelter for animals in an extremely cold winter Educating people that bees are safe
Miscellaneous problems	Delayed funding Garden outside of town, so hard to access Travelling to workshops on bad roads

Source: NMFCCC 2017

The social enterprise in Garden Hill First Nation, one of the SSE projects that is part of the NMFCCC, provides a heuristic example of the attributes and challenges of such projects. As Puzyreva (2017) explains, Garden Hill First Nation is a remote community of approximately 4500 people more than 600 km northeast of Winnipeg, the capital of the province of Manitoba. Like other Canadian First Nations, it bears the debilitating legacy of colonialism, assimilation and residential schools. The ensuing loss of culture and family ties has made it difficult for community members to preserve traditional hunting and fishing livelihoods, and undermined community food autonomy. At the same time, food is shipped in from the south at a high cost to an inconvenient location, leaving residents little choice but to purchase cheap, processed foods high in fat, sugar and salt from two convenience stores. A study of Garden Hill First Nation (Thompson, Kamal, Alam and Wiebe 2012) revealed that 51% of the households were severely food insecure, while 37% were moderately food insecure.

Puzyreva (2017) reports that a new social enterprise called Meechim Inc. was established in Garden Hill, which not only embraced community economic development but also sought to localize food production to meet community needs by starting a local farm in 2014. Historically, agriculture was imposed as a form of assimilation – the name of the community reflects this policy – but gardening continued to be practiced for a number of years, only to be replaced by the combination of welfare and the Northern Store (a private company that controls every economic aspect of community's food supply with high profits flowing out of the community – Thompson et al. 2012, 55). In spite of this replacement, food continues to carry a

strong connection with sharing, celebration and traditional medicine. In this vein, Meechim Inc. focuses on "providing affordable food and improving the health status of the community members," (Puzyreva 2017, 24) with the goal of producing locally at the farm, selling the produce at a local market below the price of the Northern Store and introducing future initiatives that promote healthy eating, such as a healthy food café.

In spite of these laudable goals, there are a number of challenges and constraints that limit the potential for Meechim Inc. to provide healthy food for all:

- The market has not been operating regularly because of a strategy review and internal reorganization
- Relationship building is difficult in such a large community
- Communication about this new initiative was not well defined
- The project has not been actively communicating with leaders in the community
- There is no sustained funding
- Lack of consumer education meant low sales of some products
- The soil is not fertile and fertilizer is an added cost
- The market has to adapt to the days community members have money (e.g., welfare payment days)
- Poor weather can prevent the market from opening and lead to food spoilage
- The Northern Store lowers its prices when the market operates
- The project only offers 10 jobs, not the promised 25
- There is a lack of accountability (resulting in theft) and management skills (Puzyreva 2017)

To date, some of the challenges have been addressed:

- An advisory board has been set up
- 6,600 lbs of fish have been purchased from the local fish plant to be used as fertilizer
- A shipping container has been retro-fitted as a permanent market structure in order to avoid theft
- A new School-to-Farm program has been created to raise awareness of healthy food options (Puzyreva 2017).

However, according to Puzyreva (2017), "the initiative is yet to develop their business strategy to address all the aforementioned challenges." Once in place, however, she feels that it should provide a model that can be replicated in other communities.

Indigenous Sustainable Local Food Solutions and Implementing other SDGs

These sustainable local food solutions developed and led by Canadian Indigenous communities not only provide models that can be replicated in other communities, but also interface with other SDGs besides zero hunger.

SDG #3: Good health and well-being

The third SDG involves ensuring healthy lives and promoting well-being at all ages (UN nd). This goal is vital to Indigenous people in Canada, who suffer from poorer health status than non-Indigenous Canadians (Subnath 2017). Many of these sustainable local food initiatives also aim to address this goal in a number of ways (see Table 2).

Table 2. Examples of Implementing SDG #3: Good Health and Well-being	
Sustainable Local Food Initiative	Aim
Helen Betty Osborne Ininiw Education Resource Centre School Garden	Establish knowledge of healthy living
Community Greenhouse in Barrows	Promote healthy eating habits
Grow North Boreal Horticulture Program	Empower youth and adults to live well
Mino Pimatciwin / Community Garden Project	Provide opportunities and spaces for residents of the Opaskwayak Cree Nation to live healthy and active lifestyles
Alex Keno Memorial Farm / Meechim Farm	Reduce dependency on southern food supplies to create healthy, long-lasting impacts for the community
Traditional Teachings Project	Increase healthy eating, exercise and healthy living
Bayline Food Buying Co-op	Increase access of isolated communities to healthy foods

Source: NMFCCC 2017

SDG #4: Quality Education

Considered the foundation to creating sustainable development, the fourth SDG not only improves quality of life, but also can help to equip local people with the tools required to develop innovative solutions to the world's greatest problems (UN nd). One of these great problems is the world-wide epidemic of obesity and non-communicable diseases caused by the industrial food system (WHO 2014; Pollan 2008). In their own way, these sustainable, local food initiatives aim to address this problem at the local level through education (see Table 3).

Table 3. Examples of Implementing SDG #4: Quality Education	
Sustainable Local Food Initiative	Aim
Helen Betty Osborne Ininiw Education Resource Centre School Garden	Establish knowledge of healthy living
Helping Hands 4-H Club Community Garden Sustainability Project	Make the garden available for educational purposes
Community Greenhouse in Barrows	Make training opportunities available locally
Grow North Boreal Horticulture Program	Be a hub of learning on gardening and greenhouse techniques for Northern boreal communities
Negginan Food Producers Co-op	Recruit community members to be active in learning

Source: NMFCCC 2017

SDG #8: Decent Work and Economic Growth

According to the United Nations (nd), sustainable economic growth will require societies to create the conditions that allow people to have quality jobs that stimulate the economy while not harming the environment. While the possibility of sustainable economic growth has not been achieved in Canada, it is even more remote for Indigenous people, who suffer from much higher levels of unemployment than the general population (Statistics Canada 2018). A number of the sustainable local food initiatives discussed in this study help to implement this SDG by providing employment and stimulating the local economy (see Table 4).

Table 4. Examples of Implementing SDG #8: Decent Work and Economic Growth	
Sustainable Local Food Initiative	**Aim**
Community Greenhouse in Barrows	Provide community employment opportunities
Youth Community Garden Project	Create meaningful employment opportunities for young people in the community
Alex Keno Memorial Farm / Meechim Farm	Increase employment opportunities
Northern Beekeeping Project	Contribute to local market opportunities
NACC Beekeeping Project	Contribute to local market opportunities

Source: NMFCCC 2017

Working toward these additional goals helps to reinforce SDG #2, providing a more holistic approach to food security in the projects included in this study.

All of these projects take place in sparsely populated, isolated communities, and while they may be small in terms of number of producers and employees and volume of production, they benefit the whole community. Although scalability may be important to other sorts of SSE projects, relationality is more important to these ones, as illustrated by the phrase 'all my relations.' This English equivalent of a phrase that is familiar to most Indigenous people in North America emphasizes the centrality of relationships with family, relatives, other human beings and all the animate and inanimate forms that can be seen or imagined, and responsibilities within the universal family (King 2004). From this perspective, scalability would be reconceived as joint action among individual community projects, such as collective purchasing, knowledge mobilization and the sharing of best practices.

Conclusion

The examples in this paper have something important to teach us about the role of the SSE in implementing the SDGs. McMurtry (2015) encapsulates this when he argues that since the SSE is fundamentally neither the state nor the market, we need to articulate it in ways that shift the focus to a different actor. He articulates this shift with his definition of the social economy as

> economic activity neither controlled directly by the state nor by the profit logic of the market, activity that prioritzes the social wellbeing of communities and marginalized individuals over partisan political directives or individual gain (McMurtry 2010, 4).

What is key about this definition is that the community and its wellbeing become the focus, not the state or the market, and economics is engaged with insofar as it serves this priority. "In this way, the fundamental site of decision-making for the SSE is the community, and, in whatever way this community considers appropriate, decisions are fundamentally democratic" (McMurtry 2015, 70).

McMurtry's conceptualization reflects the reality of many of the sustainable local food solutions initiated by Indigenous communities in Canada. As these projects attest, community comes first and residents decide upon their form of engagement. Wuttunee (2010, 180-181) adds that "Aboriginal people choose the vehicles that make the most sense for the pursuit of their development goals and will contemplate any available option to achieve such ends." She then quotes Newhouse (2004, in Wuttunee 2010, 183), who argues that when confronted with problems, Indigenous people must find solutions that are not disconnected from their "own ideas about society and social order and economies." For Wuttunee, the social economy provides solutions that are not disconnected and thus it has emerged as an effective tool of community development, particularly because it allows for a variety of forms and maintains control in the hands of Aboriginal communities.

When asking whether the SSE can help to implement the SDGs, we can learn from these examples. We need a robust, collaborative form of the SSE to address the complexity of the

SDGs – one based in community needs, not private gain or political partisanship. Definitions of the SSE based on the market or the state will not be sufficient. To achieve zero hunger, new definitions must prioritize community needs, community ownership and community control – all aspects of "the transformative notion of food sovereignty" (TFSSE 2014, v).

These definitions, in turn, can create the foundation of broad-based policy recommendations that promote the SSE as a solution to hunger within Canadian Indigenous communities, keeping in mind the larger Canadian context. The following recommendations to implement SDG #2 – Zero Hunger – fall into three interrelated categories: one general policy recommendation, three food-related policy recommendations and four SSE-related policy recommendations.

- Canada must implement the Calls to Action of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC, 2015) and develop respectful relationships with Indigenous people, particularly in terms of cultural recognition.

- Canada has no national food strategy (de Schutter 2012) and the federal government needs to implement a "joined-up food policy" that connects the relevant domains, such as agriculture, health and social and economic development (MacRae 2011) and encourages systems thinking to address hunger and ensure that everyone receives nutritious food.

- Access to traditional, 'country' foods obtained by fishing, hunting, trapping and gathering requires access to land. For this reason, ongoing land claims by Indigenous groups across Canada must be settled in a way that guarantees them access to these lands (de Schutter 2012).

- Indigenous approaches to food must be recognized and respected. In the words of the UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food, Indigenous people in Canada occupy a unique position in terms of food because of their long relationship with both traditional lands and natural resources, which is a central part of their identity (de Schutter 2012). This approach is encapsulated in the concept of Indigenous food sovereignty, "a restorative framework for nurturing our relationships with one another and the culturally important plants, animals, and waterways that provide us with food" (Koç et al. 2017, 387), which is based on four principles: food is sacred, participation, self-determination, and legislation and policy reform (Martin and Amos 2017).

- Policies explicitly supporting the SSE must be implemented at all levels of governance, keeping in mind that SSEs developed by Indigenous communities are qualitatively different from other SSE organizations across Canada because they feature quadruple bottom line indicators: economic, social, environmental and cultural (Sengupta et al. 2015).

- Umbrella organizations like the NMFCCC must be nurtured because they are crucial to supporting and maintaining SSE projects, particularly in small, isolated communities that have few resources. These second-tier organizations can co-ordinate and leverage funding, provide information, facilitate meetings, encourage learning and create linkages among participating projects.

- The future development of Indigenous SSEs in Canada must ultimately depend on "the ability of Indigenous communities to control their own resources, primarily related to land, but also including economic resources to develop businesses, human resources through education rooted in community-led and Indigenous methodologies, and applying cultural resources, including Indigenous knowledge" (Sengupta et al. 2015, 119).

- Canada does not have a national SSE policy. Such policy would need to be based in:

- o Patient and non-exploitative capital;
- o A recognition of the distinct nature of SSE organizations to facilitate them as a central economic player with all benefits;
- o Training and support for new and emergent SSE organizations, recognizing that they have higher barriers to entry;
- o A recognition in policy of SSEs as distinct entities that are recognizably different from capitalist firms.

References

Coop Canada. 2018. Co-operatives in Canada. Co-operatives and Mutuals Canada. Accessed November 3, 2018. http://canada.coop/en

de Schutter, Olivier. 2012. End of Mission Statement of the UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food. Accessed November 7, 2018. https://newsarchive.ohchr.org/en/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=12159&LangID=E

Glass, Juniper. 2016. "The Landscape of Foundations Collaborating in Canada." Working Paper # 13. Montreal Research Laboratory on Canadian Philanthropy. Accessed November 3, 2019. https://philab.uqam.ca/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/WP13Canadianlandscapeoffoundationcollaboration.pdf

King, Thomas. 2004. "All My Relations." *Aboriginal Perspectives* (pp. 71-80). Toronto: Nelson Education Ltd.

Koç, Mustafa, Jennifer Sumner and Anthony Winson, eds. 2017. *Critical Perspectives in Food Studies*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.

MacRae, Rod. 2011. "A Joined-Up Food Policy for Canada." *Journal of Hunger and Environmental Nutrition, 6*: 424-457.

Mauss, Marcel. 1967. *The Gift: Forms and Functions of Exchange in Archaic Societies*. New York: W.W. Norton.

McDougall, Corrie Lynn. 2016. "Northern Manitoba Food, Culture and Community Collaborative: An Exploration of an Innovative Collaborative Model." Working Paper #10. Montreal Research Laboratory on Canadian Philanthropy. Accessed November 3, 2018. https://philab.uqam.ca/fichier/document/McDougall_2016_Final_Northern_Manitoba_Food_Culture _and_Community__Fund.eds.jp.pdf

McMurtry, J.J., ed. 2010. *Living Economics: Canadian Perspectives on the Social Economy, Co-Operatives, and Community Economic Development*. Toronto: Edmond Montgomery.

NMFCCC. 2017. Community Stories 2017. Accessed November 3, 2018. http://tidescanada.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/NMFCCC_2017CommunityStories.pdf?platform=hootsuite

NMFCCC. nd. The Northern Manitoba Food, Culture and Community Collaborative. Accessed November 3, 2018. http://www.nmfccc.ca/

Pollan, Michael. 2008. *In Defense of Food: An Eater's Manifesto*. New York: The Penguin Press.

Puzyreva, Marina. 2017. *Harnessing the Potential of Social Enterprise in Garden Hill First Nation*. Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives, Manitoba. Accessed November 3, 2018.

https://www.policyalternatives.ca/publications/reports/harnessing-potential-social-enterprise-garden-hill-first-nation

Sengupta, Ushnish, Marcelo Vieta and J.J. McMurtry. 2015. "Indigenous Communities and Social Enterprise in Canada." *Canadian Journal of Nonprofit and Social Economy Research*, *6* (1): 104-123.

Shragge, Eric and Jean-Marc Fontan. 2000. *Social Economy: International Debates and Perspectives*. Montreal: Black Rose Books.

Statistics Canada 2018. "Aboriginal Peoples." Accessed January 20, 2019. https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/11-402-x/2011000/chap/ap-pa/ap-pa-eng.htm

Statistics Canada. 2015. "Aboriginal Peoples: Fact Sheet for Canada." Accessed November 10, 2018. https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/89-656-x/89-656-x2015001-eng.pdf

Statistics Canada. 2011. "Putting numbers into action: Aboriginal Data on the Statistics Canada Website". Accessed November 10, 2018. http://accessola2.com/superconference2015/sessions/204.pdf

Subnath, Melissa. 2017. "Indigenous Food Security in Canada: An Analysis Using the 2012 Aboriginal Peoples Survey." *Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository*, 4459. Accessed November 29, 2018. https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd/4459

Sumner, Jennifer. 2007. *Sustainability and the Civil Commons: Rural Communities in the Age of Globalization*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

TFSSE. 2014. "Social and Solidarity Economy and the Challenge of Sustainable Development." Position paper by the United Nations Inter-Agency Task Force on Social and Solidarity Economy. Accessed November 19, 2018. http://unsse.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/Position-Paper_TFSSE_Eng1.pdf

Thompson, Shirley, Asfia Gulrukh Kamal, Mohammad Ashraful Alam and Jacinta Wiebe. 2012. "Community Development to Feed the Family in Northern Manitoba Communities: Evaluating Food Activities Based on Their Food Sovereignty, Food Security, and Sustainable Livelihood Outcomes." *Canadian Journal of Nonprofit and Social Economy Research* 3 (2): 43-66

TRC. 2015. *Final Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada*. Accessed June 2, 2018. http://www.trc.ca/websites/trcinstitution/index.php?p=890

UN. nd. The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. United Nations. Accessed September 18, 2018. https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents

Utting, Peter. 2015. "Introduction: The Challenge of Scaling up Social and Solidarity Economy." In *Social and Solidarity Economy: Beyond the Fringe*, edited by Peter Utting, 1-37. London: UNRISD/Zed Books.

WHO. 2014. Obesity. World Health Organization. Accessed September 24, 2015. http://www.who.int/topics/obesity/en/

Wuttunee, Wanda. 2010. "Aboriginal Perspectives on the Social Economy." In *Living Economics: Canadian Perspectives on the Social Economy, Co-operatives, and Community Economic Development*, edited by J.J. McMurtry, 179-215. Toronto: Edmond Montgomery.