1. Define governance and relate it to the concepts of politics and institutions.
	1. Governance is the process in which public and private stakeholders make rules, with the twin aims to both address problems and promoting public and private interests.
	2. Politics is the process in which power is distributed, acquired, and used.
	3. Institutions are the rules that structure our behaviour.
	4. So governance includes both politics and institutions.
2. Can you explain, with example, all three faces of power?
	1. Power is defined as the ability of one person, group, or organisation to influence the behaviour of others in pursuit of their *interests*
	2. Power is often said to have three ‘faces’, or ways in which it can operate (Lukes 2004). The first face of power is present in situations where explicit decisions need to be made and determines who gets to influence the outcome of the decision-making process. The second face precedes the first, in a way, by determining what decisions make it onto the agenda and, conversely, which issues never get discussed in the first place. The third face involves the capacity of one person to influence what others think or want. Think of a television celebrity who has enough charisma and public exposure to convince people that what he says is true – irrespective of what they themselves might think or want. With the third face, powerful people or organisations can shape outcomes without even having to think about agenda setting or explicit decision making.
	3. As an example, think back to Chapter 11: Consumption and the basic decision consumers have to make in the supermarket: do I buy sustainable products or not? The first face of power might involve a parent checking their children’s shopping basket and forcing those who have bought unsustainable products to return them to the shelf. The second face of power shows up when the store manager of the supermarket decides to remove all unsustainable products from the shelves, thus taking the decision ‘off the agenda’ of the shopping consumer. The third face of power, finally, could be the store manager working with a local celebrity to convince consumers that they should buy sustainably.
3. What challenges cause the wickedness of food sustainability? Does it mean it is unachievable?
	1. Technical complexity, stakeholder involvement, boundary conflicts, and adaptation.
	2. In principle, it is achievable; just really, really hard. Some interpretations of wickedness, however, imply that wicked problems cannot be ‘solved’ but can only be addressed partially.
4. How can the following governance challenges be addressed?
	1. There are many right answers here, but these are the ones taken from the text:
	2. Value conflicts: including fewer stakeholders (or managing their interactions more carefully)
	3. Boundary conflicts: by reorganisation, either by combining previously separate units (e.g. for geographical or scale conflicts) or by dividing units into separate ones (e.g. for timescale conflicts)
	4. Communication blockages: including more stakeholders, or mixing stakeholders in different ways in the process of policy making
	5. Shifting circumstances: using pilot projects; emergency protocols; careful monitoring and ‘learning by doing’; and organising governance flexibly so it can be adapted to new circumstances.
5. Search for three party manifestoes in your own country and read the paragraphs concerning food or agricultural governance. What kind of types of governance do you think the various parties have in mind when they were writing these paragraphs? To what extent, and in what ways, are they aiming to address the challenges you mentioned for question 3?
	1. This answer depends very much on what the student finds in the manifestoes.