|  |
| --- |
| **Logic Model** *(based on NIFA Logic Model)* |
|  |  |  |  | **Outcomes** |
| **Situation** | **Inputs** | **Activities** | **Outputs** | **Knowledge** | **Actions** | **Conditions** |
| Confusion over rules, by both regulators and regulatedComplexity of licensing categoriesComplexity of regulatory system including delegated authoritiesStructural constraints against education and outreach | Local Food Advisory Committee structureAccess to stakeholders: MDA MDHU of MNFarmer orgsLocal food orgsFood 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 structureAnalyze 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 tasksDevelop 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 systemStrategy for implementation of proposed changes | Greater insight among all parties, including agencies, re: how agencies interact or could interactLogical 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 groupLay 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 adversarialFood entrepreneurs have a better experience when starting new venturesRegulators have systematic support to do education and outreach work |