Challenging power relations in food systems governance:
A conversation about moving from inclusion to decolonization

Session on Participatory Food Systems
Governance at the 2021 Global Food
Governance Conference [a]

Renzo Guinto [b]
St. Luke's Medical Center College of Medicine

Kip Holley [c]
K Holley Consulting

Sherry Pictou [d]
Dalhousie University

Rāwiri Tinirau [e]
Te Atawhai o Te Ao

Fiona Wiremu [f]
Te Puna Ora o Mataatua and Rehua
    Medical Centre

Peter Andreé [g]
Carleton University

Jill K. Clark [h]
Ohio State University

Charles Z. Levkoe [i]
Lakehead University

Belinda Reeve [j] *
The University of Sydney Law School

Abstract
This reflective essay explores power relations, with a particular focus on racialization, that flow through dominant forms of food systems governance, with an aim to create more participatory governance models. Four of the authors asked a group of five scholars, activists, and practitioners (also authors) who identify as Black, Indigenous or People of Color (BIPOC) to discuss during a conference session issues of Indigenous food sovereignty, decolonization, Whiteness, and inclusivity in food systems governance. This paper presents and analyzes the content of the session, part of the 2021 Global Food Governance Conference. We reflect on common themes from the session and put forth recommendations: encouraging greater inclusion in existing forms of food systems governance, achieving decolonization through creating diverse new governance models, and addressing the deeper power structures that underpin the dominant food system itself. We also suggest a

research agenda, with the "what" of the agenda unfolding from a process of agenda development that centers BIPOC scholarship. The frameworks offered by the panelists are a starting point, as more work is needed to move towards decolonizing food systems governance research. Finally, a collaborative agenda must attend to the inextricable links of food systems governance to other fundamental issues, such as the emerging field of planetary health.

Keywords
neocolonialism, racialization, settler colonialism, Whiteness, decolonization, food systems, governance

Introduction
This reflective essay is based on a session of the 2021 Global Food Governance Conference, which explored the power relations flowing through dominant forms of food systems governance. The session emphasized issues in food systems governance of Whiteness, racialization, decolonization, Indigenous food sovereignty, and inclusion. The session was co-developed by co-authors Drs. Peter Andreé, Charles Levkoe, Jill Clark, and Belinda Reeve. All are white, settler academics based in Canada (Andreé and Levkoe), the United States

(Clark), and Australia (Reeve), with research experience in various aspects of food systems governance. They aimed to respond to dominant governance models in each country in which they are based, which typically—and continue to—privilege the values, participation, and leadership of white people and settlers, while marginalizing the voices and self-determination of Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC)[1] communities, despite their active resistance.

The aim of the discussion, and this essay, was to disrupt and critique dominant governance approaches, and to generate new directions for practice, research, and policy. Accordingly, BIPOC scholars, activists, and practitioners with diverse backgrounds and areas of expertise (co-authors Guinto, Holley, Pictou, Wiremu, and Tinirau) were invited to join settler researchers in exploring these issues, and to generate proposals for more participatory models of food systems governance that center the voices and perspectives of people and communities that are traditionally excluded. This essay provides context for the discussion of food systems governance, presents abridged versions of the five co-authors' presentations, and summarizes key themes across each of them, focusing on recommendations for innovative and participatory approaches to food systems governance.

Context and Key Organizing Concepts
In the conference session and this ensuing essay, we aimed to explore various forms of power relations that impede more equitable approaches to

[b] Renzo Guinto, Associate Professor and Director, Planetary and Global Health Program, St. Luke's Medical Center College of Medicine–William H. Quasha Memorial, Philippines; renzo.guinto@gmail.com

[c] Kip Holley, Founder, K Holley Consulting, Columbus, Ohio, USA; kip.holley.direct@gmail.com

[d] Sherry Pictou, Associate Professor and the Canada Research Chair in Indigenous Governance, The Schulich School of Law and the Faculty of Management at Dalhousie University, Canada; Sherry.Pictou@dal.ca

[e] Rāwiri Tinirau, Director of Te Atawhai o Te Ao, an independent Māori research institute, Aotearoa/New Zealand; rawiri@teatawhai.maori.nz

[f] Fiona Wiremu, Chairperson of Te Puna Ora o Mataatua and Rehua Medical Centre, Executive Director, Te Whare Wānanga o Awanuiārangi, Aotearoa/New Zealand; Fiona.Wiremu@wananga.ac.nz

[g] Peter Andreé, Professor, Department of Political Science, Carleton University, Canada; PeterAndree@cunet.carleton.ca

[h] Jill K. Clark, Associate Professor, John Glenn College of Public Affairs, Ohio State University, USA; clark.1099@osu.edu

[i] Charles Z. Levkoe, Canada Research Chair in Equitable and Sustainable Food Systems, Department of Health Sciences, Lakehead University, Canada; clevkoe@lakeheadu.ca

[j] * *Corresponding author:* Belinda Reeve, Associate Professor, The University of Sydney Law School; F10 Eastern Avenue; Camperdown, NSW 2006, Australia; belinda.reeve@sydney.edu.au

[1] At the time of writing this manuscript, the authors note and appreciate that terms such as *racialized* and *BIPOC* are complicated and contested.

food systems governance. We define *governance* as the "relationships, processes, rules, practices, and structures (both institutional and discursive) through which power and control are exercised and decisions are made" (Clark et al., 2021, p. 176). We define *Whiteness* as an ideology and powerful social construct based on beliefs, values, behaviors, and attitudes that result in an unequal distribution of power and privilege based on skin color (Calgary Anti-Racism Education, 2021). As a system of privilege, Whiteness remains invisible and rarely acknowledged. We also refer to *neocolonialism*, which describes relationships between decolonizing[2] peoples and countries and former colonizing countries that perpetuate and reinforce colonial power structures through "unrecognized actions, behaviors, attitudes, and beliefs" (Eichbaum et al., 2021, p. 329; Fofana, 2021). We point to *settler colonialism* as another key form of power and control, an ongoing process of invasion that systematically erases and displaces Indigenous Peoples with settler populations and identities (Bohunicky et al., 2021; Wolfe, 2006).

A growing body of research shows how these ideologies intersect with capitalism and patriarchy to produce power relations in dominant forms of food systems governance that typically marginalize and oppress the voices, perspectives, and self-determination of BIPOC communities (Alkon & Agyeman, 2011; Conrad, 2020; Holt-Giménez & Wang, 2011; Moragues-Faus et al., 2022). For example, U.S. scholars and activists have exposed how dominant forms of food systems governance privilege white values, objectives, and decision-making processes (Conrad, 2020). The same privileging is often true of many alternative, local, or community-led food movements (Alkon et al., 2020; Guthman, 2008; Mayes, 2018; Ramírez, 2015; Slocum, 2006).

Scholars in settler colonial countries such as the U.S., Canada, Aotearoa/New Zealand, and Australia have described how processes of colonization, including the dispossession and forced removal of Indigenous Peoples from their traditional territories, have led to the deliberate destruc-tion of Indigenous food systems, knowledge, culture, and identity, as well as contributing to the disproportionate burden of food insecurity and poor diet-related health that falls on Indigenous Peoples (Browne et al., 2021). Similarly, a growing body of literature documents food injustice and power imbalances between the Global North and Global South, with settler colonization and neocolonization, trade liberalization, and foreign aid policies promulgated by colonizing countries creating a globally inequitable distribution of food system-related health, environmental, and economic costs and benefits (Gonzales, 2015). However, binaries between, for example, the Global North and the Global South, are artificial and hide nuances in how these forces and ideologies interact in complex, multifaceted ways, resulting in the homogenization of the food system to the benefit of some groups and actors, and at the expense of others.

BIPOC communities continue to resist these processes, including through anti-racist, decolonizing, and Indigenous food sovereignty and food justice movements and initiatives, which have diverse objectives and approaches (Alkon & Agyeman, 2011; Cadieux & Slocum, 2015; Daigle, 2019; Grey & Patel, 2015; Levkoe et al., 2019; Ramírez, 2015; Settee & Shukla, 2020). Further, a growing number of researchers and practitioners describe principles and approaches for creating more participatory food systems governance models (Coté, 2016; Levkoe et al., 2019, 2020; Pictou et al., 2021). However, these perspectives are too often omitted from the mainstream conversation on food systems governance. Accordingly, the session presented here sought to create a forum for discussing inclusion/exclusion in food systems governance, and what truly participative governance models might look like, that would be led by BIPOC scholars, practitioners, and activists.

Organizing the Conference Session

The session formed part of the 2021 Global Food Governance Conference, which explored how law, regulation, and policy impede or facilitate access to safe, nutritious, sustainable, and equitable food.

---

[2] We intentionally do not include a definition of decolonization and allow the term to be interpreted through the speaker's presentations.

The Conference had previously been run in 2016 and 2019 in Sydney, Australia, and was created by two white Australian researchers (Reeve, based at The University of Sydney Law School, and Alexandra Jones, at The George Institute) with expertise in food law, regulation, and policy. The Conference is a collaboration between The University of Sydney, The George Institute for Global Health, and the Global Center for Legal Innovation on Food Environments at Georgetown University and is not affiliated with any professional society or industry organization, nor is it sponsored by any such organization. Originally a nationally focused Australian event, it expanded to an international audience in 2021 when it moved online due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

The academic institutes hosting the Conference are white-majority organizations. While the 2016 and 2019 Conferences emphasized including First Nation Australians, BIPOC speakers and participants were underrepresented. Moving the Conference online in 2021 presented the opportunity to address this issue; for example, ensuring a greater representation of BIPOC keynote speakers, as well as those from Low- or Middle-Income Countries (LMICs). However, the Conference was still run within a white/high-income country/ settler-colonial institutional context, and remained dominated by white speakers, organizers, and participants.

The organizers of the session (co-authors Reeve, Andrée, Clark, and Levkoe) had a pre-existing collaboration, exploring intersections in their respective research on food system s governance in Canada, the U.S., and Australia. Via Reeve, the Conference organizers invited these scholars to create a session on inclusive food systems governance. The session organizers believed that BIPOC scholars and activists should lead the discussion and invited five BIPOC speakers to address issues of Indigenous food sovereignty, decolonization, Whiteness, and inclusivity in food systems governance. At the time, each speaker was also an academic or researcher working in this field, and thus were not offered remuneration. All speakers were invited, and agreed, to participate as co-authors in the process of developing the presentations into this reflective article.

Dr. Yandisa Ngqangashe, former research fellow at the Australian National University, chaired the session. The organizers, session chair, and speakers met twice to finalize the format and the guiding questions for speakers. During the session, Dr. Ngqngashe briefly introduced each speaker, who then spoke to their area of experience, before reflecting on three questions from the chair, which concerned each speaker's own approach to issues of governance, power, and inclusion; how issues of power and inclusion/exclusion intersect within the context of food systems governance; and what "inclusive food systems governance" meant to them. The session was conducted via an online conference hosting platform, recorded, professionally transcribed, edited by the organizing authors for clarity and reviewed by the speakers to ensure it reflected each person's intent. One organizer created a shortened version of each presentation, which was shared with the speakers to ensure that it accurately reflected their remarks and to offer the opportunity to expand upon or clarify any of the content. These shortened presentations are set out below. Speaker responses to the questions are excluded for reasons of space—as is the constructive discussion between the speakers and audience members—but these inform the final section, which reports on major themes across the presentations, generated in an interpretative process post-Conference. All authors collaborated on drafting and revising this essay.

The session had five speakers. (See Appendix for full biographies.) Dr. Renzo Guinto was the Chief Planetary Health Scientist and co-founder of the newly established Sunway Centre for Planetary Health in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. Concurrently, he is the associate professor of the practice of global public health and inaugural director of the Planetary and Global Health Program of the St. Luke's Medical Health Centre College of Medicine in the Philippines. He is also the convener of Planetary Health, Philippines. Kip Holley is an independent consultant focusing on community engagement and organizational equity. He was most recently a research associate at the Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity at Ohio State University. Fiona Wiremu is from the New Zealand tribes Tūhoe and Ngāti Ranginui.

She is an educator of Indigenous businesses and holds several governance roles across the health and social sectors. Dr. Rāwiri Tinirau is of Te Āti Haunui-a-Pāpārangi descent and has genealogical connections to several hapu [sub-tribes] and iwi [tribes] throughout Aotearoa/New Zealand. He is a director of Te Atawhai o Te Ao, an independent Māori institute, as well as deputy chair of Ngā Tāngata Tiaki o Whanganui. Dr. Sherry Pictou is a Mi'kmaw woman from L'sɨtkuk, "water cuts through high rocks," known as Bear River First Nation, in Nova Scotia. She currently holds a joint appointment at The Schulich School of Law and the Faculty of Management at Dalhousie University as an assistant professor and is the Canada Research Chair in Indigenous Governance.

The next section provides a condensed version of each presentation. Note that one of the speakers, Fiona Wiremu, experienced technical difficulties, but her research collaborator Rāwiri Tinirau was able to complete the part of her presentation that described the Mana Kai Framework.

Synthesized Presentations

Renzo Guinto

Over the past two years, I have been involved in the movement for decolonizing global health and I am also very active in the emerging field of planetary health. Tracing its roots back to colonial tropical medicine, planetary health is now a broad field pertaining to transnational health problems that affect our world today and our global responses to them (Koplan et al., 2009)—for example, the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic and our collective (or fragmented) actions to address it. Planetary health is an integrative concept that brings together the health of people and that of the natural systems on which their health depends (Whitmee et al., 2015). It is a reaction to the inadequacy of global health in responding to the worsening climate emergency and the other environmental crises affecting us today, including our defective food systems that make us unhealthy, destroy the planet, and even increase the likelihood of future pandemics. Here, I would like to explore how the global health community and the emerging planetary health community can work together with the movement advo-

cating for food systems transformation so we can come up with better, more sustainable, healthier, and more just food systems.

There are many interpretations of the term "decolonizing"; one that is widely known concerns interrogation of the superiority and dominance of Western epistemology and culture. There is no question that power is very much concentrated in the Global North, whether it is global health institutions and their leaders, the policies and the practices adopted in the global health community, how we educate our global health professionals, or the manner in which we conduct our research. We need more Indigenous voices, we need People of Color and people from the Global South to be involved in decision making, policy making, and knowledge creation. That is what we have been calling for when we say we need to decolonize global health. There are parallels between decolonizing global health and decolonizing the food system, including food policies and the structures that regulate food production and consumption.

Sadly, we are not talking sufficiently about these parallels and interconnections. For instance, right now in the context of the COVID pandemic, we know that there is still scandalous vaccine inequality around the world. Some have described it as "vaccine apartheid," generated by the colonial structure of the global health system, the pharmaceutical industry, and the policies we have created at global and national levels. But this is not an entirely new phenomenon, because for some time now we have already seen food inequality and even food apartheid around the world, which is not just creating global hunger and making food inaccessible to many people, it is also creating the pandemic of undernutrition, stunting, and underweight that affects nearly one billion people, especially children. The inequitable distribution of food is parallel with the inequitable worldwide distribution of vaccines and other health commodities. There is much to learn in terms of trying to dismantle the power asymmetries that govern both the global health system and the food system at all levels.

Furthermore, we have colonized not only our food system, our health system, and the health of people, we have also colonized the planet, the land, the water, the atmosphere through greenhouse gas

emissions and various forms of pollution. We have also colonized the ability of the future children of the world to live and thrive and survive. We are making the planet less inhabitable for them because of the slow pace of climate action. We also need to talk about how to create safeguards, not only from old colonial powers but also from neo-colonial corporate forces, which are stealing the limited seats around the decision-making table from the rightful owners, such as Indigenous Peoples, local communities, farmers and fisher folks, women, LGBT people, and children. What we must begin to realize is that the small tweaks in policies and practices that we have been employing under the guise of decolonizing are superficial and cosmetic, and are not sufficient to achieve the bigger transformations that we want to see. We really need to examine the structural causes and identify who these "colonizers" and "neocolonizers" of the food system are.

This brings me to "planetary health," which I have described as a powerful concept that brings together the health of people and the health of the planet (Whitmee et al., 2015). I may be a physician by training, but I cannot just treat the human patient anymore in this day and age. I also have to take care of the planetary patient on which the health of people depends, now and in the future. We need a planetary health approach, which I believe is also a decolonial approach to advancing the health of people and of the planet. After all, the idea that the health of people and of the natural ecosystems are deeply intertwined is something that many Indigenous cultures have embraced for centuries. We must incorporate a decolonial planetary health approach, enriched by Indigenous wisdom, to be incorporated into all kinds of discussions about the future of our food system, from local to global. Moving forward, I would love to see Indigenous perspectives positioned at the front and center whenever we discuss climate change and its relation to food and health.

Kip Holley

The research that we do, in Kip Holley's former position at the Kirwan Institute, has one foot in academia, creating knowledge and acquiring new knowledge, and another foot in communities. We work with community organizations, nonprofits, and governments to understand how to remove racial barriers to create opportunities for marginalized people to succeed and thrive. My place is to understand the role of community engagement and racial inequity. I do that by working in the academy to research and publish articles, but mostly I partner with organizations to understand and interrogate inequitable systems and policies that either purposely or inadvertently keep People of Color out of important decision-making in their communities. This work occurs through three domains.

First is to think about civic and community engagement beyond disparate, separate decisions or activities. We look at these efforts as a connected group of activities, understandings, decisions, structures, and other things that happen within communities in an environment for decision-making. Crucial principles of this work include recognizing the gifts of diverse voices to understand power and injustice, understanding trust building and empowerment, and different ways of dealing with and managing conflict that favor more diverse voices. These principles are meant to enable community and civic engagement activities to change the underlying structures to be more equitable and inclusive. They are intended to help us think about how we can make our individual activities more equitable and more inclusive, and also about how we can use those activities in connection with each other to change the underlying structures to be more authentically empowering to a larger range of people.

Empowerment and inclusivity are critical to the second domain, which involves community leadership and organizational equity. It is about interrogating the nature of the ideals that we have about leadership and success and organizing communities and organizations through a non-white lens. Most of those ideals are usually set up under a series of white-centered norms, such as perfectionism, objectivity. Instead, we really need to think about what we are not seeing. This approach informs a lot of our work in neighborhood leadership development, in which we find leaders that would otherwise be overlooked, change the way we are looking at leadership structures, and support new leaders in taking control of their neighbor-

hoods and playing a meaningful role. We also look at how organizational processes reify racial inequities both within communities and in the nonprofit and governmental sectors. We work with community members to learn more about some of the processes that we take for granted and widen the space for different practices, different understandings, and different vocabularies for organizing and engagement.

The third domain involves taking a closer look at how the underlying structures and opportunities for engagement can be a more equitable and empowering space for People of Color. We identify attributes that are harmful, more closed off and restrictive, as well as those that are coming from more anti-racist, feminist, and Indigenous traditions that widen the space. These latter attributes tend to create an environment that is more empowering and inclusive. They include, for example, the frameworks and language that we use, the practices that we abide by, the many identities that we hold, and whether we are coming from an ownership or an advocate standpoint. All these things affect the space in which we make decisions.

It is our collective situation that tends to bound the type of decisions that we make. Almost all of the equity challenges that we run into are based on how people are interacting with assumptions, frameworks, and motivations. Many of the people that we talk to who want to bring equity to the table, whether it be in a food context or any other context, are stopped immediately because we ask them to explain and re-explain the very reason for equity. Even before getting to a decision, we need to examine the motivations and backgrounds that we have set up for those kinds of decisions. When we're asked by food advocates or food policy councils in America to help with outreach to a wider group of people or to help them create more racial equity, we often back up and ask: What does your organization look like? Who created that organization? What are the underlying ideals, and assumptions about why it is done this way rather than another way? Could it be different? Equity almost always means changing the environment drastically. It's not just about making more room in a system or an environment that is already racist or inequitable to start with, but how we can change

that environment in some very foundational ways. It needs to be more than simply inclusive, ultimately creating culturally authentic ways of empowering people who are usually not involved.

Fiona Wiremu

Western conceptions underpinning the politics of food are generally unable to fully account for Māori understandings related to kai [food]. The project "He moumou kai, he moumou tāngata: Kai governance, kai sovereignty and the (re)production of kai—Enhancing culturally matched outcomes" focused on kai as a culturally defined Māori notion and examined ways in which Māori are protecting, maintaining, retaining, and controlling decision-making authority over their traditional and customary kai sources, kai systems, and kai practices. The concept of kai for Māori is holistic, it is spiritual, it has deep-rooted connections to who we are and our origins.

Our research included cross-sectorial and multidisciplinary collaboration across three hapori [community] organizations (Te Atawhai o Te Ao, Te Puna Ora o Mataatua, and REKA Trust), four Ngā Pae o te Māramatanga partner institutions (Te Whare Wānanga o Awanuiārangi, Te Atawhai o Te Ao, the University of Waikato, and the University of Otago), specialist expert advisory mātauranga Māori members (Waitangi Tribunal, Te Whare Wānanga o Awanuiārangi, and the Māori Land Court), and specialist expert advisory kai members from the University of Waikato and the University of Otago. The mātauranga Māori [Māori knowledge] gathered from hundreds of participants informed this research. The research was funded by Ngā Pae o te Māramatanga, Aotearoa/New Zealand's Māori Centre of Research Excellence.

"He moumou kai, he moumou tāngata" focused on traditional and customary mātauranga Māori practices that we as Māori undertake in relation to our kai sources, systems, and practices. A transforming framework of culturally matched outcomes was developed using a kaupapa Māori methodology and process, which was then utilized to test a sample selection of kai sovereignty initiatives. The purpose was to determine whether kai research purported to benefit Māori met the tenets developed within the framework. Three sample

cases were tested: Whanganui: Te Morehu Whenua, Whakatāne: REKA Trust, and Ōpōtiki: Whakatōhea Mussels Ltd.

The Mana Kai Framework is based on the seven tenets of mana atua, mana tūpuna, mana Māori, mana whenua/mana moana, mana tangata, mana rawa, and mana motuhake, which are discussed by Dr. Rāwiri Tinirau.

Rāwiri Tinirau

Our foods have a genealogy that connects us to our gods and to our ancestors. To fully appreciate the responsibilities we have to our natural environment, and the teachings of our ancestors, you must unravel, rediscover, and speak to those genealogies, speak to our gods, and speak to our ancestors. When you do that, you understand that the kai, the food that you eat, is their gift for you and provides those that partake with spiritual and physical nourishment. When you partake of the foods, you become more connected with your natural environment and more concerned with the state that it is in. You begin to understand everything that impacts on your places and spaces and how those things impact on your ability to grow, gather and harvest kai. You turn to the environment, and you ask it to teach you about what you can do to ensure that there is food available for future generations. Kai sovereignty projects must be deeply rooted, stem from and be grown within the community. When you are able to share kai, you enhance the prestige of the people and the community, you contribute to their health and wealth. Therefore, what is critical here are the relationships that you form locally, nationally, and, internationally, because everyone's efforts contribute to the greater purpose.

The Mana Kai Framework (Wiremu et al., 2022) was designed based on key tenets that allows for kai sovereignty initiatives to be analyzed against each of these tenets, with the overarching aim of developing a robust Kaupapa Māori process that allows each of those initiatives to be considered against the seven expressions of mana already

introduced by Fiona: Mana atua, mana tūpuna, mana Māori, mana whenua/mana moana, mana tangata, mana rawa, and mana motuhake. The Mana Kai framework is informed by the previous work of many individuals and groups to define the multiple expressions of mana.[3]

Mana atua refers to activities associated with various gods. Their power is embodied in those who uphold sacred rituals and principles. Our origin stories, based on the escapades and attributes of atua [gods], provide a way to understand the interrelationships between animals and fish, between land and ocean, and between people and the living environment. Kai sovereignty initiatives must respect that kai has a whakapapa [genealogy]. Kai is derived from domains associated with particular atua, and links between and across atua and their domains is critical to understanding the importance of kai.

Mana tūpuna is power derived through lineage, tribal identity, language, and customs, as passed down through the generations. Those inheriting mana tūpuna are responsible for carrying out duties to maintain this power. Mana tūpuna embraces tribal identity and heritage, as well as knowledge, te reo Māori [Māori language], and tikanga Māori [Māori customs]. The importance of carrying inherited responsibilities must be articulated and realized through kai sovereignty initiatives. Mana tūpuna implies a duty of care to our ancestors and the collective, in ways that are meaningful to a particular whānau [extended family], hapū [sub-tribes] and iwi [tribes].

Mana Māori are the rights and authority associated with being Māori. The expression of Māori cultural values through tikanga might differ across whānau, hapū and iwi, but are broadly similar. Māori values, concepts, and practices such as whakapapa, whanaungatanga [relationships], and tikanga are central to mahinga kai [kai gathering and harvesting]. Our histories refer to times when atua and tūpuna [ancestors] enjoyed food-secure lifestyles and good health. These histories provide inspiration for applying universal Māori values in

---

[3] As detailed in Wiremu et al. (2022), this framework is informed by the work of Williams (1971), Barlow (1991), Durie (1994; 1998), Smith (1997), Marsden and Hēnare (2003), Knox (2005), Forster (2012), Phillips et al. (2016), Te Atawhai o Te Ao (2016), Tinirau (2017), and Wiremu et al. (2019).

contemporary times within kai sovereignty initiatives, to promote healthy living and wellness, as Māori.

Mana whenua refers to the power associated with the ability of the land to be bountiful. Barlow has noted that a "person who possessed land has the power to produce a livelihood for family and tribe, and every effort is made to protect these rights" (1991, pp. 61–62). Connection to one's traditional territories also enhances well-being. Mana moana involves a similar authority over lakes and seas. A Māori worldview would consider mana whenua and mana moana together with the obligations that come with tiakitanga [custodianship]. Kai sovereignty initiatives must have regard for these authorities and responsibilities. They require the safeguarding of knowledge, resources, and the protection (or sustainability) of kai and the natural environment.

Mana tangata is mana held according to one's personal abilities, crafted through experience and knowledge acquisition. It includes both what Mahuika called the power to "direct human activity" (1992, p. 45), and the "continuity of life, humility, caring for others, and leading by example" (Te Atawhai o Te Ao, 2016, p. 1). Mana tangata implies that a person or a people must use their skills and abilities for the benefit of others, including intergenerationally, with those who require greater assistance receiving the necessary support. Thus, kai sovereignty initiatives must enhance the mana of others, now and in the future, and address equity issues for those Māori who are vulnerable.

Mana rawa is grounded in a holistic understanding of rawa as wealth and prosperity. It is important to consider kai sovereignty initiatives against economic development and well-being imperatives of whānau, hapū and iwi, including participation in micro- and/or macro-economies. Furthermore, kai sovereignty initiatives should encourage broader and deeper explorations of concepts such as wealth, prosperity, and well-being, from Māori and Indigenous perspectives.

Mana motuhake is the enactment of Māori sovereignty and authority through self-determination. Following Durie (1998), we see mana motuhake as requiring commitment to Māori

advancement, and emphasis on independence from state and Crown, implying a "measure of defiance" (p. 220). Against a backdrop of various consequences of colonization, Māori have had to reconfigure and adjust to ensure our survival and have formed and maintained relationships with those who share similar values and struggles, including Māori-to-Māori and Māori-to-Indigenous partnerships. Kai sovereignty initiatives, therefore, must be sensitive to the struggle to maintain mana motuhake, and must be committed to activating self-development strategies locally and internationally.

One kai sovereignty initiative that we can analyze through the Mana Kai Framework is Te Morehu Whenua, a hapū environmentalist group, led by our youth and by our children. The focus has been on our freshwater fisheries, which include the kākahi [freshwater mussel], tuna [eels], kōura [freshwater crayfish], ngaore [smelts], and atutahi [whitebait]. Wānanga, or traditional knowledge exchange events, teach our children and our youth about the way our ancestors fished. We are seeing more contemporary fishing practices taking hold, but we have maintained our traditional and customary practices as well. We have taught the kids how to eel the way that our ancestors eeled, how to weave the fishing baskets that our ancestors wove, to use traditional materials, to do the things that they did and to take our lead from the environment. What we have observed is that the kids start to help each other in their learning, the kids are teaching themselves, and they are having a lot of fun along the way.

Research has been a big element of this particular project, which includes teaching these children and the youth how they connect genealogically to the lands and the waterways where they practice our traditional fishing. We have gathered and continue to gather knowledge associated with our sub-tribe from our elders, repositories, family homes, museums, and archives—places where some of that knowledge lies dormant. The children and youth are also learning and practicing what it means to be an active member of their marae [traditional gathering place], and that there are certain protocols and responsibilities that must be carried out.

Our knowledge exchange events are held at our traditional gathering places, and there are certain things that children need to learn while they are in those spaces. Some have been disconnected from these places, or their whānau have been away for a few generations—our knowledge exchange events have helped them to understand the expectation we have of our upcoming generations, and to get on and do the work. Our children and youth are contributing to our sub-tribal aspirational framework by leading activities and critiquing some of the environmental and food aspirations that we have for ourselves, with guidance from our elders. The themes, outcomes, and indicators that have been set for us as a hapū—they've been reviewed, critiqued, and refined by our children and youth, and these are offerings and contributions to our hapū aspirational framework when it comes to our environmental priorities, based on their learnings through being involved in this kai sovereignty project.

Sherry Pictou
My people, the Mi'kmaw, have occupied our lands for at least 13,000 years. This is an important context for the struggle to decolonize governance today. We have long had treaties with other Indigenous peoples, and we did so again with the British in the 1700s. Since then, we have fought for our treaty rights, particularly the right to hunt and fish for food. In 1999, we won a landmark decision, the Donald Marshall Jr. Decision [*R. v. Marshall*, [1999] 3 S.C.R. 456] that upheld the 1760 and 1761 Peace and Friendship Treaties to commercially fish. Unfortunately, the government responded with fishing agreements to assimilate this treaty back into the existing management regimes that catered to the privatization of the fisheries. My work centers on trying to figure out what treaties mean to the people at the grassroots.

As Indigenous people, we have found ourselves caught between neocolonial-liberal concepts of development, such as industrial resource extraction, on the one hand, and very no-human-footprint types of conservation or "fortress conservation" (protected areas) practices on the other. These approaches impact our treaty rights. In interviewing my own people, I learned that we could

not talk about a treaty without talking about food. That was of the utmost importance. Food for us would be animals, plants, and fish that come from the land and waterscapes. These have become displaced by neocolonial development or conservation and industrial types of food systems, such as industrial or monoculture agriculture.

My work also focuses on the role of women and 2SLGBTQ+ persons in treaty negotiations. What is their role in governance systems? This is a gap that was highlighted here in Canada by *Reclaiming Power and Place: The Final Report of the National Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls* (National Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls, 2019). I've done some work on how resource extraction has impacted Indigenous women and how Indigenous women land and waterscape defenders are often criminalized for resisting development. My work shows that it is not that they are anti-development; it is that they are aware of their treaty rights, their ancestral homelands, the food and livelihoods that come from those ancestral homelands, and the importance of those lands and waters as sources of food. I've always asked the question, "Why are they defending that?" They are portrayed in the media as troublemakers, but I try to create spaces so they can discuss this in terms of Indigenous governance, and, in particular, the governance of food. How do we reconcile the various impacts of displacement on our food systems?

We need to consider different forms of food and food systems along with the power structures that are governing them. We also need to consider the degree that patriarchy and heteropatriarchy play in those food systems, especially when it comes to the displacement of Indigenous ancestral homelands as sources of food and water. With colonialism comes patriarchy, and it has been here in Canada for 500 years. We are a rich northern country, but do not let that fool you. It disguises what is really going on in Canada. This is the essence of my work right now. It comes down to the commodification of the consultation processes with Indigenous people; and that is the reason why you see so many grassroots, and particularly women and gender-diverse, persons standing up to protect their lands and waters. In some cases, they even

have to stand up against their own leadership, which has been presented (or permitted) only one way of exercising their treaty and Aboriginal rights.

When we think about inclusive food systems governance, we must ask: What does inclusivity mean? Who is being included? Who is doing the including? What are people being included into? And when we talk about food governance, whose food governance? Can multiple food systems coexist? Can the different knowledges and food knowledges coexist? Inclusivity in food governance must address the power structures of inequity, especially those that cater to the commodification of food systems to the point where only those who can afford food can have access to food. I think about food prices in North America that are rising with the pandemic, and they are triple and quadruple that in the far North. There should be no excuse for anybody to go hungry. Those are the power structures we are going to have to address, particularly in a global context. And I would even go as far as the local and national contexts, too, because there are so many power structures, and it is really about the commodification of our food systems.

The Creation of More Participatory and Empowering Forms of Food Systems Governance

The speakers described how dominant food systems governance structures privilege the interests and objectives of settlers, the patriarchy, city dwellers, the intellectual elite, and the large corporate actors in the food system ("Big Food"), which can be conceptualized as neocolonizers. Speakers also discussed how colonial, patriarchal, and racist power structures and inequalities continue to inform dominant food systems and food systems governance, displacing the participation and decision-making of BIPOC communities and people living in decolonizing (Global South) countries. As a result, the dominant forms of food systems governance produce various forms of dysfunction, including profound inequalities in food distribution and consumption, as well as modes of food production, distribution, and consumption that are environmentally harmful. Guinto argued that these pathologies in food systems governance are often perpetuated by the same forces that shape inequalities more broadly, as in global and planetary health (Abimbola et al., 2021).

Key themes can be drawn from the presentations as to how to create more participatory and empowering forms of food systems governance. One is the inclusion of a much more diverse range of people in food systems organizations and governance initiatives, which also must be designed to meet the needs of BIPOC communities and residents (Moore & Swisher, 2015; Slocum, 2006). Inclusion can be an important first step if combined with accountability mechanisms that ensure true diversity and equity (Abimbola et al., 2021). However, by itself, inclusion risks the co-option of BIPOC communities in forms of governance that only serve to maintain existing power imbalances and exclusionary structures and processes (Kepkiewicz & Rotz, 2018).

The presentations stressed that scholars, activists, and decision makers must break down and challenge the basic structures, assumptions, terminology, paradigms, and power distributions informing governance models. As discussed by Holley, these fundamental elements shape decision making by all food system actors, irrespective of their gender, socioeconomic status, geographical location, or ethnicity. The need for a transformative approach to food systems governance is illustrated by the Six Principles for Equitable and Inclusive Civic Engagement framework developed by Holley (2016), calling for forms of civic engagement that acknowledge and address racial bias, power inequalities, and historical inequities; share leadership, resources, and decision-making power more equitably; build trust; empower the most vulnerable; and overall question norms created by those in power. These principles assert that food system organizations should explicitly adopt anti-racist, feminist, and decolonizing frameworks in their policies, demonstrate active support for such concepts as Indigenous self-determination, treaty rights, and restitution (Bohunicky et al., 2021), and change organizational operating styles, cultures, values, and forms of decision making accordingly (Moore & Swisher, 2015).

These principles also indicate that white/settler-led/majority food movement organizations and food systems governance initiatives must be

based on a different model of engagement with BIPOC communities, and residents of the Global South, one that involves genuine sharing of resources, power, and authority (Moore & Swisher, 2015; Slocum, 2006) and enables problem identification, governance structures, and leadership to develop from the ground up—to be shaped and led by those who are most affected (Choudry & Kapoor, 2010; Slocum, 2006). As with Holley's discussion of the need for bottom-up governance structures, Tinirau discussed the need for Indigenous food sovereignty projects to be rooted in the community. Further, reform of existing governance models to enhance democratic deliberation is not enough: new initiatives are needed that reflect different values, cultures, traditions, and decision-making styles if we are to develop truly equitable, lasting, and empowering solutions (Moore & Swisher, 2015; Slocum, 2006). This also reflects the contemporary reality of food systems governance, which is not a universal whole but is contextual and place-based, with many diverse (and sometimes conflicting) viewpoints and voices.

There is a particular need for decision makers to learn from Indigenous frameworks and understandings of food and food systems, to challenge white norms of governance and how dominant forms of food systems governance should be conducted. Pictou, Wiremu, and Tinirau presented holistic, interconnected models that moved beyond white/settler conceptions of food as a commodity and, in doing so, challenged fundamental, dominant assumptions about how food should be produced, distributed, and governed. These models echo recent challenges to the use of terms such as sovereignty that are sourced in Western/settler governance models (Daigle, 2019; Mayes, 2018; Whyte, 2018) and point to the need for reframing the basic terminology and conceptualizations on which food systems governance is based. Panelist models presented food as interconnected with land, water, and environmental systems, and embedded in ancestral and interpersonal relationships and relationships with all of creation, which have formed a sense of place, identity, and belonging. This illustrates how the interconnections between food, health, and the environment that are increasingly recognized in research and policymaking have

long informed Indigenous understandings of food and food systems. These models also speak to the ways in which different issues and sectors influence each other, showing that food systems governance needs to take a holistic approach that recognizes the multiple ways in which food is embedded in planetary systems and human relationships (as discussed by Guinto). The idea of duty and responsibility to the environment and the food systems embedded within it may be particularly salient in an era of climate change and the escalating degradation of environmental systems.

Finally, creating more inclusive forms of food systems governance means addressing the root causes of exclusion and the deeper structural forms of power in the food system, including settler-colonialism, patriarchal power structures and institutions, capitalism, and food system corporatization. These deeper inequities can only be partly addressed by efforts at inclusion in governance models or by creating new versions of such models. Importantly, transforming food systems and food systems governance means acknowledging and facilitating the efforts of BIPOC communities to exercise their own sovereignty. This includes requiring that states recognize the land rights and rights of self-determination of Indigenous peoples and consider proposals for "Land Back" (Kepkiewicz & Rotz, 2018), as well as ensuring that BIPOC communities, and people of the Global South, have greater control over governance of the food systems of which they are part, and over political and governance structures more broadly. As the causes and symptoms of inequality and exclusion are similar across multiple planet-based and human systems, there is an opportunity to learn across sectors, as discussed by Guinto, with Tinirau also emphasizing the importance of establishing open and honest communication across different issue areas and governance domains.

These recommendations lend themselves to further research. Rather than suggesting a list of issues, we believe a more informed approach requires taking a step back. The "what" of a research agenda should flow from the process of agenda development. To center marginalized voices requires making the invisible visible, requiring new ways of seeing and doing, for which the frame-

works and principles offered by the speakers are a starting point. Collaboration with BIPOC researchers and practitioners can be used as a step toward decolonizing approaches to food systems governance research. However, collaboration needs to begin with agenda setting, rather than with BIPOC collaborators being invited to the table after an agenda has already been set, and should be based on shared leadership, decision-making power, and relationships of trust with BIPOC collaborators. Further, any collaborative research agenda should be action-oriented, and attend to the inextricable links of food systems governance to other fundamental issues, such as planetary health.

Conclusion

This paper reported on a conference session that explored how power relations inform current models of food systems governance and generated recommendations for more participatory governance models, with a particular emphasis on facilitating the voices, perspectives, and self-determination of BIPOC communities and people living in the Global South. At one level, this entails inclusion of traditionally marginalized groups in governance initiatives. However, taken together, the presentations demonstrated the need for a more fundamental reconfiguration of existing governance models,

adopting organizational structures, values, objectives, and leadership that serve the interests of and empower BIPOC communities, as well as creating new models that reflect diverse perspectives and ways of governing. At an even deeper level, there is a need to address the unequal power structures and marginalizing influences that inform the dominant food system itself, which can only be partly addressed by governance reforms, and to facilitate BIPOC communities and Global South residents in achieving food justice and reclaiming sovereignty in food systems.

References

Abimbola, S., Asthana, S., Montenegro, C., Guinto, R. R., Jumbam, D. T., Louskieter, L., Kabubei, K. M., Munshi, S., Muraya, K., Okumu, K., Saha, S., Saluja, D., & Pai, M. (2021). Addressing power asymmetries in global health: Imperatives in the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic. *PLoS Medicine*, *18*(4), Article e1003604. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1003604

Alkon, A. H., & Agyeman, J. (Eds). (2011). *Cultivating food justice: Race, class, and sustainability*. The MIT Press. https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/8922.001.0001

Alkon, A. H., Kato, Y., & Sbicca, J. (Eds.). (2020). *A recipe for gentrification: Food, power, and resistance in the city*. New York University Press. https://doi.org/10.18574/nyu/9781479834433.001.0001

Barlow, C. (1991). *Tikanga whakaaro: Key concepts in Maori culture*. Oxford University Press.

Bohunicky M., Levkoe C. Z, & Rose N. (2021) Working for justice in food systems on stolen land? Interrogating food movements confronting settler colonialism. *Canadian Food Studies/La revue canadienne des études sur l'alimentation*, *8*(2), 137–165. https://doi.org/10.15353/cfs-rcea.v8i2.452

Browne, J., Gilmore, M., Lock, M., & Backholer, K. (2021). First Nations peoples' participation in the development of population-wide food and nutrition policy in Australia: A political economy and cultural safety analysis. *International Journal of Health Policy and Management*, *10*(12), 871–885. https://doi.org/10.34172/ijhpm.2020.175

Cadieux, K. V., & Slocum, R. (2015). What does it mean to do food justice? *Journal of Political Ecology, 22*(1), 1–26. https://doi.org/10.2458/v22i1.21076

Calgary Anti-Racism Education [CARED]. (2021). *Whiteness*. https://www.aclrc.com/whiteness

Choudry, A., & Kapoor, D. (2010). Learning from the ground up: Global perspectives on social movements and knowledge production. In A. Choudry & D. Kapoor (Eds.), *Learning from the ground up: Global perspectives on social movements and knowledge production* (pp. 1–13). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230112650_1

Clark, J. K., Lowitt, K., Levkoe, C. Z., & Andreé, P. (2021). The power to convene: Making sense of the power of food movement organizations in governance processes in the Global North. *Agriculture and Human Values*, *38*(1), 175–191. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10460-020-10146-1

Conrad, A. (2020). *Identifying and countering white supremacy culture in food systems*. World Food Policy Center, Sanford School of Public Policy, Duke University. https://wfpc.sanford.duke.edu/reports/identifying-and-countering-white-supremacy-culture-in-food-systems/

Coté, C. (2016). "Indigenizing" food sovereignty. Revitalizing Indigenous food practices and ecological knowledges in Canada and the United States. *Humanities*, *5*(3), Article 57. https://doi.org/10.3390/h5030057

Daigle, M. (2019). Tracing the terrain of Indigenous food sovereignties. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, *46*(2), 297–315. https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2017.1324423

Durie, M. H. (1994). *Whaiora: Māori health development*. Oxford University Press.

Durie, M. H. (1998). *Te mana te kāwanatanga: The politics of Māori self-determination*. Oxford University Press.

Eichbaum, Q. G., Adams, L. V., Evert, J., Ho, M. J., Semali, I. A., & van Schalkwyk, S. C. (2021). Decolonizing global health education: Rethinking institutional partnerships and approaches. *Academic Medicine*, *96*(3), 329–335. https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000003473

Fofana, M. O. (2021). Decolonising global health in the time of COVID-19. *Global Public Health, 16*(8–9), 1155–1166. https://doi.org/10.1080/17441692.2020.1864754

Forster, M. E. (2012). *Hei whenua papatipu: Kaitiakitanga and the politics of enhancing the mauri of wetlands* [Doctoral thesis, Massey University]. Theses and dissertations. http://hdl.handle.net/10179/3336

Gonzales, C. G. (2015). Food sovereignty and food justice. In M. Valverde, K. Clarke, E. Darian-Smith, & P. Kotiswaran (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of law and society* (pp. 132–137). Routledge.

Grey, S., & Patel, R. (2015). Food sovereignty as decolonization: Some contributions from Indigenous movements to food system and development politics. *Agriculture and Human Values*, *32*(3), 431–444. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10460-014-9548-9

Guthman, J. (2008). "If they only knew": Color blindness and universalism in California alternative food institutions. *The Professional Geographer*, *60*(3), 387–397. https://doi.org/10.1080/00330120802013679

Holley, K. (2016). *The principles for equitable and inclusive civic engagement: A guide to transformative change*. The Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity, The Ohio State University. https://pfc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/ki-civic-engagement.pdf

Holt-Giménez, E., & Wang, Y. (2011). Reform or transformation? The pivotal role of food justice in the US food movement. *Race/Ethnicity: Multidisciplinary Global Contexts*, *5*(1), 83–102. https://doi.org/10.2979/racethmulglocon.5.1.83

Kepkiewicz, L., & Rotz, S. (2018). Toward anti-colonial food policy in Canada? (Im)possibilities within the settler state. *Canadian Food Studies/La Revue canadienne des études sur l'alimentation*, *5*(2), 13–24. https://doi.org/10.15353/cfs-rcea.v5i2.202

Knox, C. (2005). *Whakapumau te mauri: Values-based Māori organisations* [Doctoral thesis, Massey University]. Theses and dissertations. http://hdl.handle.net/10179/912

Koplan, J. P., Bond, T. C., Merson, M. H., Reddy, K. S., Rodriguez, M. H., Sewankambo, N. K., Wasserheit, J. N., & Consortium of Universities for Global Health Executive Board. (2009). Towards a common definition of global health. *Lancet*, *373*(9679), 1993–1995. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(09)60332-9

Levkoe, C. Z., Ray, L., & Mclaughlin, J. (2019). The Indigenous food circle: Reconciliation and resurgence through food in northwestern Ontario. *Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems, and Community Development*, *9*(Suppl. 2), 101–114. https://doi.org/10.5304/jafscd.2019.09B.008

Levkoe, C. Z., Hammelman, C., Reynolds, K., Brown, X., Chappell, M. J., Salvador, R., & Wheeler, B. (2020). Scholar-activist perspectives on radical food geography: Collaborating through food justice and food sovereignty praxis. *Human Geography, 13*(3), 293–304. https://doi.org/10.1177/1942778620962036

Mahuika, A. (1992). Leadership: Inherited and achieved. In M. King (Ed.), *Te ao hurihuri: Aspects of Maoritanga* (pp. 42–63). Reed Publishing.

Marsden, M., & Hēnare, M. (2003). Kaitiakitanga: A definitive introduction to the holistic world view of the Māori. In T.A.C. Royal (Ed.), *The woven universe: Selected writings of Rev. Māori Marsden* (pp. 54–72). Estate of Rev. Māori Marsden.

Mayes, C. (2018). *Unsettling food politics: Agriculture, dispossession and sovereignty in Australia*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Moore, K., & Swisher, M. E. (2015). The food movement: Growing white privilege, diversity, or empowerment? *Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems, and Community Development*, *5*(4), 115–119. https://doi.org/10.5304/jafscd.2015.054.013

Moragues-Faus, A., Clark, J. K., Battersby, J., & Davies, A. (2022). Towards urban food governance for more sustainable and just futures. In A. Moragues-Faus, J. K. Clark, J. Battersby, & A. Davies (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of urban food governance* (pp. 1–19). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003055907-1

National Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls. (2019). *Reclaiming power and place: The final report of the National Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls.* https://www.mmiwg-ffada.ca/final-report/

Phillips, C., Jackson, A., & Hakopa, H. (2016). Creation narratives of mahinga kai: Māori customary food-gathering sites and practices. *MAI Journal*, *5*(1), 63–75. https://doi.org/10.20507/MAIJournal.2016.5.1.5

Pictou, S., Robin, T., Parker, B., & Brady, J. (2021). Pestiewink/Wihokewin: Invitation to Indigenous and intersectional feminist food studies. In K. Mustafa, J. Sumner, & A. Winson (Eds.), *Critical perspectives in food studies* (3rd ed.) (pp. 90–104). Oxford University Press.

Ramírez, M. M. (2015). The elusive inclusive: Black food geographies and racialized food spaces. *Antipode*, *47*(3), 748–769. https://doi.org/10.1111/anti.12131]

Settee, P., & Shukla, S. (Eds.). (2020). *Indigenous food systems: Concepts, cases, and conversations*. Canadian Scholars.

Slocum, R. (2006). Anti-racist practice and the work of community food organizations. *Antipode*, *38*(2), 327–349. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8330.2006.00582.x

Smith, G. H. (1997). *The development of kaupapa Māori: Theory and praxis* [Doctoral thesis, University of Auckland]. Doctoral theses. http://hdl.handle.net/2292/623

Te Atawhai o Te Ao [Independent Māori Institute for Environment and Health]. (2016). *Strategic Plan 2016–2021*.

Tinirau, R. S. (2017). *Te kura i Awarua: Understanding, valuing and practising tikanga in Māori businesses and organisations* [Doctoral thesis, Massey University]. Theses and dissertations. http://hdl.handle.net/10179/12465

Whitmee, S., Haines, A., Beyrer, C., Boltz, F., Capon, A. G., de Souza Dias, B. F., Ezeh, A., Frumkin, H., Gong, P., Head, P., Horton, R., Mace, G. M., Marten, R., Myers, S. S., Nishtar, S., Osofsky, S. A., Pattanayak, S. F., Pongsiri, M. J., Romanelli, C. … Yach, D. (2015). Safeguarding human health in the Anthropocene epoch: Report of The Rockefeller Foundation-Lancet Commission on Planetary Health. *Lancet*, *386*(10007), 1973–2028. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(15)60901-1

Whyte, K. (2018). Food sovereignty, justice and Indigenous peoples: An essay on settler colonialism and collective continuance. In A. Barnhill, M. Budolfson, & T. Doggett (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of food ethics* (pp. 345–366). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199372263.013.34

Williams, H. W. (1971). *A dictionary of the Māori language* (7th ed.). Wellington, New Zealand: Government Printer.

Wiremu, F., Tinirau, R. S., Gillies, A., Smith, G. H., Heitia, M., Smith, C. W., Coates, J., & O'Sullivan, C. (2022). *He moumou kai, he moumou tāngata: Kai governance, kai sovereignty and the (re)production of kai—Enhancing culturally matched outcomes* [Research report]. Te Atawhai o Te Ao [Independent Māori Institute for Environment and Health]. https://teatawhai.maori.nz/resources/he-moumou-kai-he-moumou-tangata-kai-governance-kai-sovereignty-and-the-reproduction-of-kai-enhancing-culturally-matched-outcomes-a-research-report-prepared-for-nga-pae-o-te-maramatanga/

Wiremu, F., Tinirau, R. S., Heitia, M., & Coates, J. (2019, December 12). *He moumou kai, he moumou tangata kai governance, kai sovereignty* [Paper presentation]. Mahika Kai Conference, Christchurch, Aotearoa New Zealand.

Wolfe, P. (2006). Settler colonialism and the elimination of the native. *Journal of Genocide Research*, *8*(4), 387–409. https://doi.org/10.1080/14623520601056240

Appendix. Speakers' Biographies

Renzo Guinto is the Chief Planetary Health Scientist and co-founder of the newly established Sunway Centre for Planetary Health in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. Concurrently, he is the Associate Professor of the Practice of Global Public Health and Inaugural Director of the Planetary and Global Health Program of the St. Luke's Medical Health Centre College of Medicine in the Philippines. He is also the convener of Planetary Health, Philippines, a community of Filipino planetary health advocates, scholars, and practitioners who are exchanging ideas, forging collaborations, and advancing the new discipline of planetary health. An Obama Foundation Asia-Pacific Leader and Aspen Institute New Voices Fellow, Renzo has served as a consultant for various organizations, sits on editorial boards for multiple journals, and is a member of several international groups, including the Lancet-Chatham House Commission on Improving Population Health Post-COVID-19 (University of Cambridge) and the Lancet One Health Commission (University of Oslo). Renzo obtained his Doctor of Public Health degree from Harvard University and his Doctor of Medicine degree from the University of the Philippines, Manila. In 2020, Renzo was included by *Tatler* magazine in its Gen.T List of 400 leaders of tomorrow who are shaping Asia's future.

Kip Holley is an independent consultant focusing on community engagement and organizational equity. He was most recently a research associate at the Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity at Ohio State University, where he studied using community engagement, cultural community, and civic leadership strategies to promote racial equality. Kip is the author of *The Principles for Equitable and Inclusive Civic Engagement: A Guide to Transformative Change*, Kirwan's keystone publication regarding civic engagement. He has also played a primary role in developing the curriculum and administration for the United Way of Central Ohio Neighborhood Leadership Academies and has facilitated over 200 presentations, trainings, and workshops related to equitable civic engagement. Kip is a graduate of the Ohio State University, with an M.S.W. from the College of Social Work and a B.S. in city and regional planning from the Knowlton School of Architecture.

Fiona Wiremu is from New Zealand's Tribes of Tūhoe and Ngāti Ranginui. Her areas of research include mātauranga Māori [Māori knowledge], inclusive of language, culture, and identity; whai rawa [Māori economics]; te tai ao [the natural environment]; mauri ora [human flourishing]; and Māori community self-development initiatives inclusive of food sovereignty research. She is an educator of Indigenous businesses and holds several governance roles across the health and social sectors that intercede in the ongoing colonization and reproduction of unequal social, economic, and cultural relations experienced by Māori. Fiona was a primary researcher on the project "He moumou kai, he mouou tāngata: Kai governance, kai sovereignty and the (re)production of kai—Enhancing culturally matched outcomes*."*

Dr. Rāwiri Tinirau is of Te Āti Haunui-a-Pāpārangi descent and has genealogical connections to several hapu [sub-tribes] and iwi [tribes] throughout Aotearoa/New Zealand. He is a director of Te Atawhai o Te Ao, an independent Māori institute focused on health and environmental research, as well as deputy chair of Ngā Tāngata Tiaki o Whanganui, the post-settlement governance entity of the Whanganui River claims settlement. Rāwiri serves on a number of governance and advisory boards and has presented on the distinctive Māori cultural notion of kai versus Western cultural meanings associated with food, resulting from the He Moumou Kai research project. As part of this research, the team developed the Mana Kai Framework, which involves a robust Māori process to analyze kai sovereignty initiatives against the various expressions of mana [prestige].

Dr. Sherry Pictou is a Mi'kmaw woman from L'sɨtkuk, "water cuts through high rocks," known as Bear River First Nation, in Nova Scotia. She currently holds a joint appointment at The Schulich School of Law and the

Faculty of Management at Dalhousie University as an Assistant Professor and is the Canada Research Chair in Indigenous Governance. Sherry is also a former chief for her community and a former Co-Chair of the World Forum of Fisher Peoples. She currently serves as the District Chief for the Confederacy of Mainland Mi'kmaq and is a member of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) Task Force on Indigenous and Local Knowledge. Her research interests include decolonizing treaty relations, social justice for Indigenous women, and Indigenous knowledge and food systems.