|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Logic Model** *(based on NIFA Logic Model)* | | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  | **Outcomes** | | |
| **Situation** | **Inputs** | **Activities** | **Outputs** | **Knowledge** | **Actions** | **Conditions** |
| Confusion over rules, by both regulators and regulated  Complexity of licensing categories  Complexity of regulatory system including delegated authorities  Structural constraints against education and outreach | Local Food Advisory Committee structure  Access to stakeholders:  MDA  MDH  U of MN  Farmer orgs  Local food orgs  Food buyers (co-ops, groceries, restaurants, distributors)  Base level of knowledge and trust among groups involved in LFAC | Assemble work group composed of stakeholders recruited via LFAC structure  Analyze licensing categories and ID areas of confusion (already begun via LFAC)  Analyze regulatory system and ID areas of confusion/overlap/gaps (already begun via LFAC)  Develop organizational chart for MDA and MDH to identify logical pathways for licensing, inspection, & oversight tasks  Develop consensus list of potential actions to address issues, ordered by ease and cost of accomplishing and ID who will implement | Proposal for changes to MDA & MDH food licensing and inspections system  Strategy for implementation of proposed changes | Greater insight among all parties, including agencies, re: how agencies interact or could interact  Logical layout for regulatory system with food safety, regulatory efficiency, and business viability as co-equal goals | Rapid implementation of “low-hanging fruit” identified by work group  Lay groundwork for implementation of more complex actions identified by work group | Improved climate for “regulated community” to understand and comply with food regulations; more of a partnership in food safety and less adversarial  Food entrepreneurs have a better experience when starting new ventures  Regulators have systematic support to do education and outreach work |