



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations



Milan Urban Food Policy Pact Monitoring Framework

July 2018 version

Indicator 1: Presence of an active municipal interdepartmental government body for advisory and decision making of food policies and programmes (e.g. interdepartmental food working group, food policy office, food team)

MUFPP framework of actions' category: Governance

The indicator allows for (self) assessment of the presence, multi-stakeholder representation and integration, functioning and effectiveness of an interdepartmental/sectoral food coordination body or mechanism. It helps identify areas for improvement.

Overview table

MUFPP Work stream	Governance- Ensuring an enabling environment for effective action
MUFPP action	Facilitate collaboration across city agencies and departments and seek alignment of policies and programmes that impact the food system across multiple sectors and administrative levels, adopting and mainstreaming a rights-based approach; options can include dedication of permanent city staff, review of tasks and procedures and reallocation of resources
What the indicator measures	The indicator allows for (self) assessment of the presence (yes or no), multi-stakeholder representation and integration, functioning and effectiveness (with use of a scoring sheet) of an interdepartmental/sectoral food coordination body or mechanism. It helps define areas for improvement.
Which variables need to be measured / what data are needed	Information is collected on Presence (yes/no); Multi-stakeholder Representation and Integration; Functioning and Effectiveness. Variables and criteria used for self-assessment are indicated in the scoring sheet below.
Unit of measurement <i>(i.e. Percentages, averages, number of people, etc.)</i>	Not applicable. This indicator will be assessed in a qualitative way.
Unit(s) of Analysis <i>(i.e. people under 5 years old, etc.)</i>	Not applicable. This indicator will be assessed in a qualitative way.

Possible sources of information of such data	-Self-assessment among representatives participating in the coordination body. Possibly validated by assessment of external actors. -Minutes/ reports of the food working group/ programme -External evaluation and study reports
Possible methods/tools for data-collection	-Group discussion for self-assessment, most likely the cheapest approach -External evaluation -Ad hoc surveys to capture opinions of stakeholders and target groups -Key informants interviews
Expertise required	None for the self-assessment
Resources required/ estimated costs	For the self-assessment: Low to none, assessment can be implemented during a meeting of the coordination body
Specific observations	Any self-assessment is by nature not objective. This self-assessment first and for all seeks to enable a joint learning process of stakeholders involved and enable the improvement of the interdepartmental body (functioning, planning and delivery). Furthermore, collecting and analysis of information done collectively contributes to a capacity development process.
Examples of application	The city of Ede (The Netherlands) has created a dedicated municipal food team of 5 people and appointed the first food councillor in the Netherlands. The team is responsible for operationalising Ede's food strategy. In 2017, an external evaluation was asked to assess the functioning of the team and the implementation of the strategy. Applying amongst others a qualitative assessment, some of the findings of the evaluation where: -Having a well-staffed food team and corresponding budget is crucial to implementation of the food strategy. -Establishment of various partnerships with other (municipal) parties that contribute to the implementation of activities has laid an important foundation for a true integral vision and anchoring in the Ede society. -However, The "Why" of the Food vision and the integral nature of the Food programme's work are currently insufficiently visible in internal and external communication. A good communication strategy needs to be developed. - Current human and administrative support will need to be better anchored in permanent structures and budgets.

Rationale/evidence

The Milan Urban Food Policy Pact encourages interdepartmental and cross-sector coordination internal to city governments¹, working to integrate urban food policy considerations into social, economic and environment policies, programmes and initiatives, such as, inter alia, food supply and distribution, social protection, nutrition, equity, food production, education, food safety and waste reduction.

Such interdepartmental and cross-sector institutional mechanisms or bodies (food bodies, units or teams), will enhance dialogue and coordination, policy integration, impacts, and efficiency gains by 'breaking down institutional silos'. Analysis of various successful examples of such coordination mechanisms shows that key government actors include authorities that are responsible for: agriculture, health/nutrition, social protection, economic development, markets, planning, transport, and climate change².

¹ This call for coordination can be expanded to engagement of other levels of government (vertical integration) and non-governmental stakeholders (civil society, research organisations, private sector) in forming, implementing and assessing food policy. Note that these levels of coordination are also covered in Indicator 2: *Presence of an active multi-stakeholder food policy and planning structure (e.g. food policy councils; food partnerships; food coalitions)*.

² See the following reports: <http://www.milanurbanfoodpolicypact.org/good-practices/>;
<http://www.ruaf.org/publications/city-region-food-systems-and-food-waste-management-2016>;
<http://www.ruaf.org/urban-food-policies-and-programmes-overview>.

It should be noted that mere presence of an interdepartmental/sectoral coordination body (yes or no) will not provide sufficient indications on actual levels of coordination, results-impacts and gains. It will therefore be important to also assess the functioning and effectiveness of the coordination body (e.g. is it having *regular meetings*; does it have *sufficient human and financial resources* to make sure that the coordination body/mechanism functions; does the coordination mechanism actually *result* in concrete collaboration initiatives and city policies; are the functioning of the coordination body, its activities, results and impacts *monitored* to drive analysis of lessons learned and impacts as a basis for further planning and improvements).

Successful examples also highlight that clear and strong *institutionalisation* of the coordination body/mechanism in the local government structures and budgets, reduces the risks of changes in city administration and shifts in allocation of budgets and is key to mainstreaming food in municipal policies. Securing the food body and programmes through legislation also makes them more resilient to government changes.

Finally, and in order to gain broader political and public support, *transparent information sharing* on the roles, activities and achievements of the coordinating body/mechanism will be crucial.

[Glossary/concepts/definitions used](#)

Presence of a municipal interdepartmental government body for advisory and decision making of food policies and programmes: Whether the municipal government has set up a formal or informal structure that is responsible for advisory and decision-making regarding the formulation and/or implementation of food policies and programmes, and thus has a formal mandate to promote coordination across line departments and sectoral programmes.

Depending on the city, interdepartmental/sectoral coordination bodies/mechanisms on urban food policies and plans, have various denominations. These vary from a *food policy office* (e.g. the Comune di Milano has recently established a Food Policy Office called "Ufficio Segretariato del MUFPP e Coordinamento Progetti Food Policy), a *municipal food unit or secretariat* (The city of Belo Horizonte, Brazil created a Municipal Secretariat for Food Policy and Supply-SMAAB with the objective to develop an integrated urban policy for food security and to coordinate all food policies and programmes towards achieving the city's overall goal: increasing the Right to Food and access to healthy food by all its citizens). The creation of the SMAAB, with a separate administrative structure and budget, mainstreamed food security into the municipal public policy), a *food team* (as in Ede, The Netherlands) or an *interdepartmental working group* on urban food issues.

Multi-stakeholder representation and integration: Extent to which different departments and sectors within the municipal government are a member of the coordination body/mechanism. Extent to which the body coordinates and interacts with other levels of government and non-governmental stakeholders (including CSOs, NGOs, private sector, academia etc.)

Functioning and effectiveness of the coordination body/mechanism: A government supported structure that is well functioning, ensures coherence of urban food policy and programme interventions to avoid duplications and gaps across various programmes and stakeholders, and collaborates in the formulation and implementation of cross-sectoral urban food policies and programmes. Criteria used here include: Is the coordinating body adequately staffed? Have partnerships been established? Are there clear mandates/terms of reference? Is it institutionalised within the local government (supported by law)? Does the coordinating body deliver on concrete collaborative initiatives, policies, and impacts? Is the coordinating body properly funded (with a clear own budget, budget for the body and its plans are included in institutional budgets of each of the members); Are there good M&E systems and regular reporting?

Preparations

The following preparations refer to a self-assessment exercise:

1. In case a interdepartmental coordinating body exists: Inclusion of an agenda item on monitoring food governance indicators on the agenda of one of the meetings of the interdepartmental/sectoral coordination body. During this meeting all governance related indicators (1-6) can be jointly discussed by all members of the coordinating body. The monitoring guidelines can be shared with all involved prior to the meeting.
2. In case such body does not exist: the indicator can be reported on by the contact person in the city for urban food policies and the Milan Pact. This person may decide to discuss the indicator and scoring sheet with other stakeholders involved in the formulation and implementation of urban food strategies/policies/projects and action plans. The exercise may contribute to a (future) reflection and planning process on the importance, role and set up of such a coordinating body.
3. The internal self-assessment can be validated with selected external stakeholders, especially where mechanisms of information sharing are concerned.

In case other evaluations methods are selected (external evaluation, key informant interviews) respective preparations should be taken.

Sampling

In case of a self-assessment exercise: Preferably all representatives in the coordinating body should participate in the monitoring exercise. They should collectively fill in the scoring sheet provided below.

In addition, a randomly sampled number of both government and non-governmental stakeholders (citizens, research organisations, NGOs Community Based Organisations, private sector) could be asked if they are aware of the existence and roles of the coordinating body (yes/no) and if they have access to information on its existence and performance (yes/no). Such questions could be included in a broader food-related survey. Perceptions of these or of specific stakeholders on other scoring variables could also be sought, if desired.

Data collection and data disaggregation

During a meeting of the coordinating body the following scoring sheet can be discussed and filled. Individual members may first want to make their own assessment before discussing this in the larger group. Alternative, a facilitator could from the start guide group discussion and assessment in an interactive and participatory way. Specific observations made during the meeting (for example on levels of consensus or differences in opinions and scores) can be added in the final column and used for future reference or further discussions. Also recommendations for improvement can be added here.

Scoring sheet

Characteristics	Self-assessment and explanation			Total score	Disaggregation of information	Specific observations / Recommendations
Presence of an interdepartmental/sectoral coordination body on urban food (within the municipality)						
Presence:	Yes =1 point	No=0 points	X A coordination body exists but is	Total score:	Provide information on the type of coordinating body and its focus (only urban agriculture, the	

			set up and managed by non-governmental stakeholders		broader urban food system).	
Multi-stakeholder representation and integration						
Representation: Representation in the coordinating body of different departments and sectors within the city government	Strong= 2 points Strong: The coordination mechanism has a large representation of different sectors, including a.o. agriculture, health/nutrition, social protection.	Moderate= 1 point Moderate: The coordination mechanism has representation of a couple of sectors	Low= 0 points Low: The coordination mechanism has quite limited representation of different sectors (very few sectors)	Total score:	-List and number of different sectors participating and their roles -List sectors not engaged that could be involved in future	
Vertical integration: The interdepartmental body coordinates actions with other governments at local, national and intergovernmental levels	Strong= 2 points Strong coordination with one or more other levels of government (neighbourhood, province, country) or other municipal governments in the city region	Moderate= 1 point Moderate coordination with one or more other levels of government (neighbourhood, province, country) or other municipal governments in the city region	Weak=0 points Weak coordination with one or more other levels of government (neighbourhood, province, country) or other municipal governments in the city region	Total score:	-List and number of other governments engaged and forms of coordination -List governments/ levels not engaged that could be involved in future	
Multi-stakeholder integration: The interdepartmental body coordinates actions with other non-governmental stakeholders (civil society groups, research, private sector)	Strong=2 points Strong coordination with one or more other non-government stakeholders (civil society, research, private sector)	Moderate= 1 point Moderate coordination with one or more other non-government stakeholders	Weak=0 points Weak coordination with other non-government stakeholders	Total score:	-List and number of other non-governmental stakeholders engaged and forms of coordination --List of other non-governmental stakeholders not engaged that could be involved in future <i>(Note: See further Indicator 2 on Presence of an active multi-stakeholder food policy and planning structure)</i>	

Functioning and effectiveness:						
<u>Criteria:</u>						
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It has a clear mandate 2. It is institutionalised in the local government structure 3. It has regular meetings during the year 4. Members actively participate in meetings and decision-making and contribute to the dialogue 5. The coordination body/mechanism has an adequate number of human resources dedicated to the functioning of the coordination mechanism 6. It has adequate financial resources allocated to the functioning of the coordination body/system (Note that funding for implementation of an urban food strategy or programme is covered under Indicator 3). 7. It has regular information exchange; information is widely shared within the city government and with a larger general public on the existence, role, activities and achievements of the coordinating food body 8. It engages in urban food policy/programme formulation; cross departmental/ city initiatives /policies have emerged from the coordinating food body 9. It has power over its members to enforce recommendations and hold them accountable 10. The functioning and activities of the coordination body are monitored, as are results and impacts of its activities to guide further planning and inform on its impacts and policy contributions. 						
Functioning and effectiveness: The coordinating body is well functioning, ensures coherence of urban food policy and programme interventions and collaborates in the formulation and implementation of cross-sectoral urban food policies and programmes.	Strong= 2 points A minimum of 6-10 criteria apply	Moderate = 1 point A minimum of 3-6 criteria apply	Low= 0 points Less than 3 criteria apply	Total score:	Provide information on: -Mandate/ Terms of Reference -Level of institutionalisation: Indicate the policy decision and/or law institutionalising the body and its current statute; indicate levels of integration in institutional budgets and programmes -Number and type of meetings held and agenda points discussed -Staff numbers and time dedicated -Amount and source of budget available for the functioning of the coordination body -Number and types of programmatic collaborations on food (between 2 or more departments) and other city initiatives/policies designed, implemented or planned. -Monitoring mechanisms, tools and reports - Information and outreach mechanisms and target groups	
Total score:						

Note: For the purposes of these guidelines certain qualifiers and scoring points are defined in the scoring sheet above as to determine an overall score or value of the indicator. Nevertheless, for certain cities some of the qualifiers or scoring levels will be more crucial than others to determine the score of the indicator. Cities could, based on the local context and priorities, identify other or additional key qualifiers or scoring levels to define the overall score of the indicator. For example, one city may decide that the allocation of a budget is the key qualifier to define the functioning and effectiveness of an active municipal interdepartmental government body –and thus given this criterion an additional

scoring point-, while another city may consider other qualifiers more relevant for the same indicator. Alternatively a city could decide to score each of the 10 criteria for functioning and effectiveness with 1 point, with a total possible score of 10 points.

In a similar way, a city may decide to give more importance to multi-stakeholder representation and integration and use a more detailed scoring system for scoring these variables: yes= the coordination body is coordinating with specific stakeholders (civil society, private sector, academia/research; specific other levels of government or other municipal governments) = 1 point per stakeholder; no coordination = 0 points.

Data analysis/calculation of the indicator

Based on the scoring and further (disaggregated) information provided, members of the coordinating body may jointly identify areas for strengthening or improvement. Preferably, such action plan would be developed in the same or a following meeting of the coordinating body, during which each of the members confirm their commitments and agree on further (regular) monitoring and information exchange. The self-assessment exercise can be repeated once a year to monitor uptake of agreed improvements/changes.



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations



Milan Urban Food Policy Pact Monitoring Framework

July 2018 version

Indicator 2: Presence of an active multi-stakeholder food policy and planning structure (e.g. food policy councils; food partnerships; food coalitions)

MUFPP framework of actions' category: Governance

The indicator allows for (self) assessment of the presence, multi-stakeholder representation and functioning and effectiveness of a multi-stakeholder body or mechanism for urban food policy and planning. It helps define areas for improvement.

Overview table

MUFPP Work stream	Governance- Ensuring an enabling environment for effective action
MUFPP action	Enhance stakeholder participation at the city level through political dialogue, and if appropriate, appointment of a food policy advisor and/or development of a multi-stakeholder platform or food council, as well as through education and awareness raising.
What the indicator measures	The indicator allows for (self) assessment of the presence (yes or no), multi-stakeholder representation, functioning and effectiveness (with use of a scoring sheet) of a multi-stakeholder body or mechanism for urban food policy and planning. It helps define areas for improvement.
Which variables need to be measured / what data are needed	Information is collected on Presence (yes/no); Multi-stakeholder Representation; Functioning and Effectiveness. Variables and criteria used for self-assessment are indicated in the scoring sheet below.
Unit of measurement <i>(i.e. Percentages, averages, number of people, etc.)</i>	Not applicable. This indicator will be assessed in a qualitative way.
Unit(s) of Analysis <i>(i.e. people under 5 years old, etc.)</i>	Not applicable. This indicator will be assessed in a qualitative way.
Possible sources of information of such data	-Self-assessment among representatives participating in the multi-stakeholder body. Possibly validated by assessment of external actors. -Minutes/reports of the food council/partnership/programme -External evaluation and study reports

The views expressed in this product are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of FAO.

Possible methods/tools for data-collection	-Group discussion for self-assessment, most likely the cheapest approach -External evaluation -Ad hoc surveys to capture opinions of stakeholders and target groups -Key informants interviews
Expertise required	None for the self-assessment
Resources required/ estimated costs	For the self-assessment: Low to none, assessment can be implemented during a meeting of the multi-stakeholder body
Specific observations	Any self-assessment is by nature not objective. This self-assessment first and for all seeks to enable a joint learning process of stakeholders involved and enable the improvement of the multi-stakeholder body (functioning, planning and delivery). Furthermore, collecting and analysis of information done collectively contributes to a capacity development process.
Examples of application	The city of Toronto created a multi-stakeholder food policy council in 1991 (http://tfpc.to/). The food policy council assessed its own functioning, to allow also sharing of experiences with other cities. For more information on the Toronto Food Policy Council and the different stakeholders involved see Annex 1.

Rationale/evidence

Multi-stakeholder processes are increasingly considered to be an important element of policy design, action planning and implementation. By involving multiple stakeholders in decision-making, it is much more likely that policies and programmes will be developed that are more inclusive and more successful in their implementation.

Although city governments may collaborate in food related projects and programmes with one or more other stakeholders (e.g. private sector, NGOs, research), this stakeholder participation is often narrowly determined by a single project, donor request or other and may not necessarily form part of a more formalised stakeholder engagement strategy.

The Milan Urban Food Policy Pact calls for full and meaningful inclusive multi-sector and multi-stakeholder engagement in food advisory and policy bodies and structures, that seek to form, implement, assess and revise food policy to encourage equitable, resilient and sustainable food systems. Such multi-stakeholder bodies can take the form of a food policy council, multi-stakeholder working group or food coalition.

Such multi-stakeholder mechanisms and bodies should be promoted at four different levels:

- (i) **Among various departments and programmes internal to city governments** (“horizontal integration”). See indicator 1: *Presence of an active municipal interdepartmental government body for advisory and decision making of food policies and programmes*.
- (ii) **Urban and rural local governments in a given (functional) city region** that promote cross-jurisdictional dialogue and collaboration among urban and rural authorities that are not generally used to engaging in joint policy and planning¹;
- (iii) **Multi- or vertical levels of government** that link local urban food system programmes to the wider (sub)national policy framework on agriculture, food and nutrition security, and urban development. The involvement of subnational (provincial, county) and national governments is vital to addressing food systems, agriculture, food waste, and land use planning across several jurisdictions (outside municipal boundaries) and to ensuring the aggregation of rural and urban food production needed to offer consumers a diversified and sufficient safe and nutritious supply of produce. They also play a crucial role in making available (additional) human and financial resources needed for programme implementation, for developing (sub)national level policies and programmes that accompany city-level strategies, and for supporting the scaling out of experiences to other areas.
- (iv) **Different types of stakeholders** including research, civil society groups (NGOS, Community Based Organisations, social movements, consumer groups), private sector (food producers, processing, retail, catering and non-food urban based actors like landowners, financing, housing, water and energy companies), and governments, ensuring real community participation and mobilising public-private-civil sector support.

Like for Indicator 1 (*Presence of an active inter an active municipal interdepartmental government body for advisory and decision making of food policies and programmes*), it should be noted that mere presence of a multi-stakeholder mechanisms/body will not provide sufficient indications on actual levels of multi-stakeholder engagement and coordination, results-impacts and gains. It will therefore be important to also assess the functioning and effectiveness of the multi-stakeholder body (e.g. is it having *regular meetings*; does it have *sufficient human and financial resources* to make sure that the multi-stakeholder body functions; does the multi-stakeholder body actually *work on* concrete collaboration initiatives and city policies; are the functioning of the multi-stakeholder body, its

¹ The Metropolitan District of Quito (Ecuador) and the Toronto Greater Golden Horseshoe Food and Farming Alliance (<http://www.foodandfarming.ca/>) are among the multi-stakeholder bodies that have linked urban and rural authorities and created networks to support joint food policy and planning.

activities, results and impacts *monitored* to drive analysis of lessons learned and impacts as a basis for further planning and improvements).

Successful examples also highlight that clear and strong *institutionalisation* of the multi-stakeholder body/mechanism in local government or institutional structures and budgets, reduces the risks of institutional and staff changes and shifts in allocation of budgets, and is key to mainstreaming food in government and institutional policies and plans. Securing the multi-stakeholder food body and programmes through legislation also makes them more resilient to government changes.

In order to gain broader political and public support, *transparent information sharing* on the roles, activities and achievements of the coordinating body/mechanism will be crucial. Finally, specific attention should be paid to facilitating *the inclusion of the urban poor and vulnerable groups*².

Glossary/concepts/definitions used

Presence of a multi-stakeholder food policy and planning structure or body: Whether the municipal government has set up a formal or informal structure that is responsible for advisory and decision-making regarding the formulation and/or implementation of food policies and programmes, and thus has a formal mandate to promote coordination across different municipal programmes, among urban and rural governments, among different levels of governments and with a variety of non-governmental stakeholders.

Depending on the city, these multi-stakeholder bodies on food policy and planning have various denominations. Food policy councils (or partnerships or coalitions) are the most known. The **Food Policy Council** (FPC) model has emerged in North America over the last three decades as an attempt to address gaps in food policy and planning. Today over 100 food policy councils exist across North America, Europe and other continents in cities and regions with growing food movements. FPCs have proven to have synergistic value, creating new relationships, partnerships, and programs. FPCs bring together diverse stakeholders to study a local food system and offer recommendations for policy change, members represent the full spectrum of food system activities: farmers, gardeners, chefs, restaurateurs, food processors, wholesalers, farm and food worker advocates, grocers, consumers, public health practitioners, anti-hunger and food security advocates and government representatives. Though they take many forms and serve different purposes, FPCs are united in their interest to transform the food system through collaboration³.

Multi-stakeholder representation: Extent to which different governmental and non-governmental stakeholders are a member of the multi-stakeholder food body. This can involve:

- Horizontal integration** and representation on urban and territorial food systems – i.e., across departments and sectors in city governments.
- Vertical integration** and representation: i.e., across governments at local, national and intergovernmental levels.
- Government versus non-governmental representation.

The concept of **stakeholders** has emerged in recent decades as crucial for understanding decision-making and policy formulation on a wide range of issues. It supplements (and to a certain extent

² See further: Dubbeling, M, H. de Zeeuw and R. van Veenhuizen, 2011. Cities, poverty and food: multi-stakeholder policy and planning in urban agriculture. RUAF Foundation and Practical Action. <http://www.ruaf.org/publications/cities-poverty-and-food-multi-stakeholder-policy-and-planning-urban-agriculture>. See also Dubbeling M. and H. de Zeeuw. Process and tools for multi-stakeholder planning of the urban agro-food system. In: De Zeeuw H. and P. Drechsel. Cities and agriculture-Developing Resilient Urban Food Systems, 2015. Earthscan. <http://www.ruaf.org/process-and-tools-multistakeholder-planning-urban-agro-food-systems>

³ See also: Sussman L. and K. Bassarab, 2017. 2016 Food Policy Council Report. Johns Hopkins Center for a Livable Future. <http://www.foodpolicynetworks.org/food-policy-resources/?resource=933>

supplants) the related concept of actors. 'Stakeholders' refers to all individuals, groups and organizations that play a role in a policy process and have an interest in the policies or plans that are to be developed, either as individuals or as members of a group or organisation. This includes people who influence a decision, or can influence it, as well as those affected by it. Stakeholders in the urban food system typically include:

1. Various types of actual rural, peri-urban and urban farmers and consumers / groups / organisations
2. Actors involved in different parts of the food chain including processing industry, wholesale and retailers, input supply, restaurants, markets, waste management, consumers etc.
3. Different municipal, metropolitan and provincial departments, NGO's, universities/research institutes, community based organisations and support organisations dealing with food and related areas (transport, health, agriculture, economic development, land use planning, parks and green spaces, social and educational programmes, etc.).

Functioning and effectiveness of the multi-stakeholder body: A government supported structure that is well functioning, ensures coherence of urban food policy and programme interventions to avoid duplications and gaps across various programmes and stakeholders, and collaborates with multiple stakeholders in the formulation and implementation of urban food policies and programmes. Criteria used here include: Is the multi-stakeholder body adequately staffed? Have partnerships with different stakeholders been established? Are there clear mandates/terms of reference? Is it institutionalised within the local government (supported by law, with a clear own budget, budget for the body and its plans are included in institutional budgets of each of the member organisations)? Is the multi-stakeholder body properly funded (budget)? Does the multi-stakeholder body deliver on concrete collaborative initiatives, policies, and impacts? Are there good M&E systems and regular reporting?

Preparations

The following preparations refer to a self-assessment exercise:

1. In case a multi-stakeholder food body exists: Inclusion of an agenda item on monitoring food governance indicators on the agenda of one of the meetings of the multi-stakeholder food body. During this meeting all governance related indicators (1-6) can be jointly discussed by all members of the multi-stakeholder food body. The monitoring guidelines can be shared with all involved prior to the meeting.
2. In case such body does not exist: the indicator can be reported on by the contact person in the city for urban food policies and the Milan Pact. This person may decide to discuss the indicator and scoring sheet with other stakeholders involved in the formulation and implementation of urban food strategies/policies/projects and action plans. The exercise may contribute to a (future) reflection and planning process on the importance, role and set up of such a multi-stakeholder food body.
3. An internal self-assessment can be validated with selected external stakeholders, if so desired.

In case other evaluations methods are selected (external evaluation, key informant interviews) respective preparations should be taken.

Sampling

In case of a self-assessment exercise: Preferably all representatives in the multi-stakeholder body should participate in the monitoring exercise.

A randomly sampled number of both government and non-governmental stakeholders (citizens, research organisations, NGOs Community Based Organisations, private sector) could be asked if they

are aware of the existence and roles of the multi-stakeholder food policy and planning body (yes/no) and if they have access to information on its existence and performance (yes/no). Such questions could be included in a broader food-related survey. Perceptions of these or of specific stakeholders on other scoring variables could also be sought, if desired.

Data collection and disaggregation

During a meeting of the multi-stakeholder body the following scoring sheet can be discussed and filled. Individual members may first want to make their own assessment before discussing this in the larger group. Alternative, a facilitator could from the start guide group discussion and assessment in an interactive and participatory way. Specific observations made during the meeting (for example on levels of consensus or differences in opinions and scores) can be added in the final column and used for future reference or further discussions. Also recommendations for improvement can be added here.

Scoring sheet

Characteristics	Self-assessment and explanation			Total score	Disaggregation of information	Specific observations/ Recommendations
Presence of a multi-stakeholder body on urban food policy and planning						
Presence:	Yes =1 point	No=0 points	X A multi-stakeholder body exists but is set up and managed by non-governmental stakeholders	Total score:	Provide information on the type of multi-stakeholder body and its focus (only urban agriculture, the broader urban food system).	
Multi-stakeholder representation and integration						
Representation: Representation in the multi-stakeholder body of different departments and sectors within the city government	Strong= 1 point Strong: The multi-stakeholder body has a large representation of different sectors, including a.o. agriculture, health/nutrition, social protection.	Moderate= 1 point Moderate: The multi-stakeholder body has representation of a couple of sectors (few sectors)	Low= 0 points Low: The multi-stakeholder body has quite limited representation of different sectors (very few sectors)	Total score:	-List and number of different sectors participating and their roles -List sectors not engaged that could be involved in future	
Vertical integration: The multi-stakeholder body integrates other governments at local, national and intergovernmental levels (vertical integration)	Yes= 1 point	No=0 points	Scoring per category:			
	Participation of neighbourhood/district level governments	No participation of neighbourhood/		Total score:	For each category: -List and number of other governments participating and their roles -List governments/ levels not engaged that could be involved in future	

		district level governments				
	Participation of other municipal governments in the city region	No participation of other municipal governments in the city region				
	Participation of other sub-national higher levels (e.g. province) of governments	No participation of other sub-national higher levels (e.g. province) of governments				
	Participation of the national government	No participation of the national government				
	Others...					
Multi-stakeholder participation: The multi-stakeholder body counts with participation of other non-governmental stakeholders (civil society groups, research, private sector)	Yes= 1 point	No=0 points	Scoring per category:	Total score:	-List and number of other non-governmental stakeholders participating and their roles --List other non-governmental stakeholders not engaged that could be involved in future	
	Participation of civil society	No participation of civil society				
	Participation of consumers	No participation of consumers				
	Participation of private sector	No participation of private sector				
	Participation of academia/research	No participation of academia/research				
	Other...					
Social inclusion: representation of specific vulnerable groups (youth, women, migrants, low income consumers/producers)	Yes= 1 point	No=0 points	Scoring per category (optional)	Total score:	-List and number of vulnerable groups participating and their roles --List vulnerable groups not engaged that could be involved in future	
Functioning and effectiveness:						

Criteria:						
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It has a clear mandate 2. It is institutionalised in the local government structure 3. It has regular meetings during the year 4. Members actively participate in meetings and decision-making and contribute to the dialogue 5. The multi-stakeholder body has an adequate number of human resources dedicated to the functioning of the coordination mechanism 6. It has adequate financial resources allocated to the functioning of the multi-stakeholder body (Note that funding for implementation of an urban food strategy or programme is covered under Indicator 3). 7. It has regular information exchange; information is widely shared within the city government and with a larger general public on the existence, role, activities and achievements of the multi-stakeholder body 8. It engages in urban food policy/programme formulation; cross departmental, governmental and multi-stakeholder food initiatives /policies have emerged from the multi-stakeholder body 9. It has power over its members to enforce recommendations and hold them accountable 10. The functioning and activities of the multi-stakeholder body are monitored, as are results and impacts of its activities to guide further planning and inform on its impacts and policy contributions. 						
Functioning and effectiveness: The coordinating body is well functioning, ensures coherence of urban food policy and programme interventions and collaborates in the formulation and implementation of cross-sectoral urban food policies and programmes.	Strong= 2 points A minimum of 6-10 criteria apply	Moderate = 1 point A minimum of 3-6 criteria apply	Low= 0 points Less than 3 criteria apply	Total score:	Provide information on: -Mandate/ Terms of Reference -Level of institutionalisation: Indicate the policy decision and/or law institutionalising the body and its current statute; indicate levels of integration in institutional budgets and programmes -Number and type of meetings held and agenda points discussed -Staff numbers and time dedicated -Amount and source of budget available for the functioning of the coordination body -Number and types of programmatic collaborations on food (between 2 or more departments) and other city initiatives/policies designed, implemented or planned. -Monitoring mechanisms, tools and reports - Information and outreach mechanisms and target groups	
Total score:						

Note: For the purposes of these guidelines certain qualifiers and scoring points are defined in the scoring sheet above as to determine an overall score or value of the indicator. Nevertheless, for certain cities some of the qualifiers or scoring levels will be more crucial than others to determine the score of the indicator. Cities could, based on the local context and priorities, identify other or additional key qualifiers or scoring levels to define the overall score of the indicator. For example, one city may decide that the allocation of a budget is the key qualifier to define the functioning and effectiveness of a multi-

stakeholder food policy and planning body –and thus given this criterion an additional scoring point-, while another city may consider other qualifiers more relevant for the same indicator. Alternatively a city could decide to score each of the 10 criteria for functioning and effectiveness with 1 point, with a total possible score of 10 points.

Data analysis/calculation of the indicator

Based on the scoring and further (disaggregated) information provided, members of the multi-stakeholder body may jointly identify areas for strengthening or improvement. Preferably, such action plan would be developed in the same or a following meeting of the multi-stakeholder body, during which each of the members confirm their commitments and agree on further (regular) monitoring and information exchange. The self-assessment exercise can be repeated once a year to monitor uptake of agreed improvements/changes.

Annex 1: The Toronto Food Policy Council (TFPC)

The TFPC was established by the Toronto City Council in 1991 as a subcommittee of the Board of Health to advise the City of Toronto on food policy issues. The idea for the TFPC was championed by Councillor Jack Layton, and grew out of a ‘healthy city’ initiative that the City was leading. The TFPC brings together citizens and local policy makers engaged in food issues, and by doing so has become a focal point for new policy dynamics surrounding food and agriculture in Toronto and provides a forum for action across the food system. Initially, the focus of the TFPC was mainly on food and public health, but now it covers all aspects of the food system, including agriculture, economic development, wellbeing, social justice, and environmental sustainability.

The TFPC has up to 30 members (see figure 1 below), along with 1 full-time coordinator. Members include individuals from the Board of Health, City Councillors (who play an important role in linking work of the TFPC to wider city processes), the Toronto Youth Policy Council, individuals from farm and rural communities in the Greater Toronto Area, as well as up to 22 citizen members including members from Toronto Public Health, Toronto City Council, University of Toronto, the non-profit Young Urban Farmers Community Shared Agriculture, Everdale Environmental Learning Centre, Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, Greater Toronto Area Agricultural Action Committee, Evergreen Brick Works, FoodShare Toronto, The Stop Community Food Centre, Toronto Youth Food Policy Council, Ryerson University, food lawyers, and community activists. Members are appointed for three-year terms. Consistent efforts are needed to ensure good participation of the private sector.

Today’s Food Policy Council has primarily four functions:

1. To act as a **forum** for food issues, fostering communication among sectors, communities and different groups within the food system;
2. To raise public awareness, **coordinate between issue sectors, and integrate issues** of food, health, transportation and economic development;
3. To generate **locally appropriate policy** to change the context for agriculture, hunger, health, and other local issues; and
4. To formulate **programmes** that implement local solutions to the most pressing failures of our current food system.

TFPC meetings are held once a month and are open to the public. Meetings alternate in discussing strategic initiatives (once every 2 months) and in presenting activities of different working groups (in the alternate months). Working groups for example work on public markets, promoting good food markets (affordable food in low income markets), food waste, food poverty and food sovereignty.

The TFPC has a small own budget (ca. 15,000 USD/year). Much of the funded food work is embedded in other programme and institutional member budgets and may not specifically be allocated to food. Under an overall guiding Food Strategy, TFPC and its members support many initiatives that together create food system change.

TFPC developed a monitoring matrix for Food Policy Analysis: it analysed each project and presented overlapping themes for food systems change. So far key impact indicators on poverty, health, etc. are not used as this diverts too much energy and resources from other projects. In specific cases, monitoring is done at project specific level.

Over the past two decades the TFPC has made significant contributions to the GrowTO Urban Agriculture Action Plan, Golden Horseshoe Food and Farm Action Plan, Toronto Food Strategy, Toronto Environmental Plan, Toronto Food Charter, the Official Plan, and the Toronto Food and Hunger Action Plan, and has facilitated City engagement with the Greater Toronto Area Agricultural Action Committee. As part of this work, Toronto adopted a Food Charter in 2001 and a Food Strategy in 2010.

Figure 1: Stakeholders involved in the TFPC.





Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations



Milan Urban Food Policy Pact Monitoring Framework

July 2018 version

Indicator 3: Presence of a municipal urban food policy or strategy and/or action plans

MUFPP framework of actions' category: Governance

The indicator allows for (self) assessment of the presence and level of implementation of a municipal urban food strategy/policy and/or action plan. If desired, critical assessment of the actual strategy/policy or action plan itself may be implemented in addition. Both exercises help define areas for improvement.

Overview table

MUFPP Work stream	Governance- Ensuring an enabling environment for effective action
MUFPP action	Develop or revise urban food policies and plans and ensure allocation of appropriate resources within city administration regarding food-related policies and programmes; review, harmonise and strengthen municipal regulations; build up strategic capacities for a more sustainable, healthy and equitable food system balancing urban and rural interests.
What the indicator measures	The indicators allows for (self) assessment of the presence and level of implementation of a municipal urban food strategy/policy and/or action plan with use of a scoring sheet. If desired, critical assessment of the actual strategy/policy or action plan itself may be implemented in addition. Both exercises help define areas for improvement.
Which variables need to be measured / what data are needed	First, information is collected on Presence of a food strategy/policy and/or action plan, Level of implementation, Budget, and Transparency. Further in-depth critical assessment of the food strategy/policy/action plan itself requires information to be collected on Justification, Vision and Objectives, Policy measures and instruments, Targets and monitoring; Institutional framework and Financial resources.
Unit of measurement <i>(i.e. Percentages, averages, number of people, etc.)</i>	Metrics proposed include: -Amount (and sources) of budget for the urban food policy/strategy/plan; % of total municipal budget spend on the urban food policy/strategy/plan -Number and type of information and outreach mechanisms and target groups
Unit(s) of Analysis	Specific target groups: income or socioeconomic wealth class, age, specific areas in the city, specific other groups

The views expressed in this product are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of FAO.

<i>(i.e people under 5 years old, etc.)</i>	
Possible sources of information of such data	-Self-assessment among stakeholders involved in the urban food policy/strategy/action plan (including those participating in an interdepartmental coordinating or multi-stakeholder food body). Possibly validated by assessment of external actors. -Minutes/ reports on implementation and monitoring of the urban food policy/strategy/action plan -External evaluation and study reports
Possible methods/tools for data-collection	-Group discussion for self-assessment and analysis of the strategy/policy/action plan documents, most likely the cheapest approach -External evaluation -Ad hoc surveys to capture opinions of stakeholders and target groups -Key informants' interviews
Expertise required	Expertise in policy formulation/strategic planning
Resources required/ estimated costs for monitoring	The first level of assessment will not require a large amount of funding. It can for example be implemented during a meeting of an interdepartmental coordinating or multi-stakeholder food policy and planning body if these exist. The in-depth critical assessment of the strategy/policy/action plan requires specific effort and sufficient staff time. Note that the development or revision of an urban food strategy/policy or action plan requires its own human and financial resources.
Specific observations	
Examples of application	The City of Ghent (Belgium) developed in 2015 its Food Strategy , which includes clear strategic and operational goals. Through participatory approaches, initiatives corresponding to these goals are co-created and co-developed with different relevant stakeholders. The food strategy only has had limited dedicated funds. But through building synergies with other government programmes and sectors, such as poverty reduction, urban planning, activating temporary spaces, a large number of initiatives have been made possible. These are keys to ensure success.

Rationale/evidence

Local governments that have signed the Milan Urban Food Policy Pact have all acknowledged and (re)claimed jurisdictional responsibility for food systems activities that directly impact the health and well-being of their residents. Cities and citizens increasingly recognise that local authorities and governments have a role to play to address problems related to urban food insecurity, hunger, the increase of diet-related chronic diseases, the growing dependency on global food markets and large-scale supermarket chains, and the growing vulnerability of the urban food system (distortions in globalised food supply chains, impacts of climate change).

A local government can chose to implement one or more specific, spatial (from neighbourhood level to city-wide programmes) and time-bound projects and programmes on urban food systems or decide to develop a specific policy. The scope and focus of these policies and/or programmes vary widely, ranging from single-issue policies and plans that address one or more specific elements of the food system (e.g. policies to support residential and community gardening, municipal local food procurement policies, policies to improve the food distribution network in underserved areas of the city, food waste reduction and management plans, programmes supporting urban agriculture, farmers markets, nutrition campaigns) to comprehensive approaches that seek to assess and plan the urban food system including the complex interactions between its various components (production, transport, processing, distribution, consumption and waste-management) and the social, ecological and economic interactions between the food system and other urban systems. This indicator refers to the presence of such a comprehensive municipal urban food policy or strategy and/or action plans.

The mere presence of such municipal urban food policy, strategy and/or action plan (present or not) will not provide sufficient indications on its actual implementation, results and impacts and gains. It will therefore be important to also assess if the policy/strategy and/or action plans are actually *implemented* by the city and other engaged stakeholders and have specific or programmatic *budgets* allocated to them. Budgets for implementation can be allocated in the city's annual budget, in institutional budgets of other stakeholders (other levels of government, non-governmental stakeholders- see also indicator 2 *Presence of an active multi-stakeholder food policy and planning structure*) or (regularly) included in other city departmental projects and programmes and budgets that include specific food activities. If possible, it is important that the community, voluntary sector and business contributions are shown in conjunction to municipal funding, as the funding the voluntary sector or businesses attract is sometimes more than that invested by the local authority.

As for indicator 1 (*Presence of an active inter an active municipal interdepartmental government body for advisory and decision making of food policies and programmes*), and 2 (*Presence of an active multi-stakeholder food policy and planning structure*), and in order to gain broader political and public support, *transparent information sharing* on the existence, implementation and impacts of the food policy/strategy or action plan will be crucial.

If desired, the actual food strategy/policy or actions plans can themselves be critically assessed on a variety of issues, including its justification, objectives, selected policy measures and instruments, institutional framework, financial resources and monitoring. A specific methodology is suggested for this purpose.

Glossary/concepts/definitions used

Food strategy: Food strategies can take many forms, and are conditioned by their local context. The term 'food strategy' is referred to by the Milan Urban Food Policy Pact as a process consisting of how a city envisions change in its food system, and how it strives towards this change. Food strategies aim to place food on the urban agenda, capitalising on efforts made by existing actors and creating synergistic effects by linking different stakeholder groups. For this purpose, a Food Strategy is the document which sets out a long-term vision for food in a given area/multiple areas (e.g., securing food security, ensuring food commercial vibrancy reducing food waste). The key priorities outlined in a food strategy are variable, depending on the local need of the community.

Food action plan: A Food Action Plan (or a Food Implementation Plan) sets out the priority projects, and the key partnerships, needed to move from strategy to action. An action plan covers the delivery period of the projects and activities that will be implemented over a fixed time period. The action plan reaffirms the strategy's priorities themes, but it aims to focus on the delivery of those priorities. An [action](#) plan has three major components (1) Specific tasks: what will be done and by whom; (2) Time horizon: when will it be done; (3) Resource allocation: what specific funds are available for specific activities.

Food policy: A food policy is the sum total of food actors' actions, from signals of intent to the final outcomes, which effect how food is produced, processed, distributed, purchased, protected and disposed. A food policy does not always need laws (in some cases, for instance, food policies can be made without any new laws). In other words, the law is only one of the ingredients which constitute a policy. A food policy is in fact the result of a set of activities: agenda setting, policy making, implementation process and evaluation.

Preparations

For the self-assessment:

1. In case an urban food policy/strategy/plan exists: organisation of a meeting with as many stakeholders as possible involved in the formulation and implementation of the food strategy/policy/action plan. During this meeting one or all governance related indicators (1-6) could be jointly discussed. The respective monitoring guidelines can be shared with all involved prior to the meeting.
2. In case an urban food policy/strategy/plan does not exist: the indicator can be reported on by the contact person in the city for urban food policies and the Milan Pact. The exercise may contribute to a (future) reflection and planning process on the importance, role and set up of such urban food policy/strategy or action plan.
3. The (self) assessment can be validated with selected external stakeholders, also to get wider inputs on possible areas for improvement.

In case other evaluation methods are selected (external evaluation, key informant interviews) respective preparations should be taken.

Sampling

Preferably all –as many as possible- stakeholders involved in the formulation and implementation of the food strategy/policy/action plan should participate in the monitoring exercise.

For the general assessment: In addition, a randomly sampled number of external stakeholders not participating in the design and implementation of the urban food policy/strategy/action plan could be asked if they are aware of the existence, content and results of a municipal urban food strategy/policy/action plan (yes/no). Such questions could be included in a broader urban food-related survey.

For the in-depth assessment: In addition, a randomly sampled number of representatives of different target groups and government and institutional representatives that were/are not directly involved in the food strategy/policy/action plan formulation and implementation could be consulted in a specifically organised review meeting.

Data collection and data disaggregation

During a monitoring/review meeting the following scoring sheet and table can be discussed and filled. Specific observations made during the meeting can be added in the final column. Also recommendations for improvement can be added here.

Scoring sheet: General assessment on presence of an urban food policy/strategy/action plan, budget for implementation and information sharing

Characteristics	Scoring		Total score:	Disaggregation of information	Observations/Recommendations
	Yes= 1 point	No= 0 points			
Presence of a municipal urban food policy	Yes= 1 point	No= 0 points		Add the strategy document and summarise its content	
Presence of a municipal urban food strategy	Yes= 1 point	No= 0 points		Add the policy document and summarise its content	
Presence of (a) municipal urban food action plan(s)	Yes= 1 point	No= 0 points		Add the action plan and summarise its content	

Level of institutionalisation	The policy/strategy/action plan is backed up by a law, bylaw, ordinance	The policy/strategy/plan is included in municipal structures and budgets	The policy/strategy/plan is included in structures and budgets of other organisations			
	Yes=1 point; No = 0 points	Yes=1 point; No = 0 points	Yes=1 point; No = 0 points			
Level of implementation: is the food strategy/policy/action plan actually implemented?	Yes, completely = 2 points	Partially = 1 point	No= 0 points		Indicate reasons for partial or non-implementation	
					Indicate what stakeholders are (or should in future be) engaged in implementation	
Budget for implementation I- A specific budget for implementation of the food policy/strategy/action plan is allocated as part of the city's annual budget	Yes= 1 point	No= 0 points			Indicate –if available- the budget amount and % of the total municipal budget it represents	
Budget for implementation II- Implementation of the food policy/strategy/action plan is funded by tapping into different local government departmental/sectoral funds and programmes	Yes= 1 point	No= 0 points			Indicate –if available- the budget sources and funding amounts contributed	
Budget for implementation III- Implementation of the food policy/strategy/action plan is co-funded by other government (subnational and national) and non-governmental stakeholders	Yes= 1 point	No= 0 points			Indicate –if available- the budget sources (number and variety of sources) and funding amounts contributed	
Transparency: Information is widely shared within the city government, non-government stakeholders and with a larger general public on the existence, implementation and results/impacts of the food policy/strategy/action plan	Yes= 1 point	No= 0 points			Number and type of information and outreach mechanisms and target groups	
Total score:						

It may be relevant to further critically assess the municipal urban food policy/strategy and/or action plans themselves in order to highlight areas of improvements of the actual strategy/policy/action plan. The following table provides a framework to do so¹:

¹ Adapted from Handout Critical Policy Review. RUAF Foundation

Critical analysis of the food strategy/policy/action plan

What to analyse / document	Points of attention	Identification of possible improvements
Justification (background)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How was the food policy/strategy/action plan formulated; who were involved? - Was the (baseline) situation analysed in an integrated way or only from one specific view point (e.g. health, or environment, or social)? - Have both problems and potentials, negative and positive impacts been reviewed? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Could the relevancy of this policy/strategy/action plan for specific categories of the population -and/or its legitimacy and popular support- be improved by taking other interests and viewpoints into account (farmers, poor, women, other sectors, private enterprise, etc.)? - Could the design be improved by improving the actual biased situation analysis through adding other viewpoints and impact areas?
Vision / Objectives / expected results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Do stated objectives indicate a clear vision regarding the desired development of the urban food system (the functions one expects the urban food system to play in the realisation of municipal or national strategic development plans/sector policies and the kind of developments in the urban food system that will be supported or conditioned/restricted)? -What type of urban food system is promoted? - Are the objectives well defining the expected results in given time periods? - Are the target groups for this policy/strategy/action plan well defined? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Could the policy/strategy/action plan be improved by clarifying the city's vision on the future development of the urban food system and the desired role/functions it should fulfil? - Could the policy/strategy/action plan be improved by a better formulation of the objectives or by a better definition of the target groups (inclusion of others, more specific)?
Selected policy measures and instruments to realise these objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -What policy measures/instruments are applied? - Is an effective mix of policy measures / instruments applied (economic incentives, educational measures, legal measures, planning measures; each instrument is having its specific effects and restrictions)? - Do the policy measures taken have a scientific basis? - Are specific interests of vulnerable groups taken into account and measures taken to ensure active participation of these groups? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is it realistic to expect that the objectives/expected results will be realised with the actual policy measures? -What policy measures/instruments have worked well? Which ones have not worked well? - What alternative policy measures could be applied to improve the effectiveness of the policy/strategy/action plan, e.g. by adding other types of policy measures /instruments (or replacing existing ones by others)? - What adaptations of existing and inclusion of additional measures could be made to enhance gender sensitivity of the policy/strategy/action plan? - Check whether certain measures are not based on false assumptions regarding certain impacts of the urban food system and are not unnecessary restrictive or over optimistic regarding the expected effects of certain policy measures. - Collect research data and information on successful experiences on this issue elsewhere, which may form a good basis for design of more effective policy measures. - What improvements could be made to enhance the relevance/benefits of the policy/strategy/action plan for vulnerable groups and enhancing gender and social equity?
Targets and monitoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Have clear (monitoring) targets been set? -Are financial and human resources assigned to conduct regular monitoring and/or evaluation of the policy/strategy/action plan? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Should formulation of targets be revised/improved to allow for their actual monitoring? -Have baseline data be collected? -Do financial and human resources for monitoring need to be increased? -Is training on data collection and analysis needed? -What results have been achieved so far? - What problems have been encountered up to date and with what effects? What has been tried to tackle these problems and with what results? - Which recent innovative projects and experiences have been undertaken that can be used to improve existing policy strategies and instruments?

<p>The institutional framework for the operationalisation, implementation and monitoring of the policy/strategy/action plan</p>	<p>- Does the policy/strategy/action plan define which organisation will lead and coordinate the operational planning and implementation of the various policy measures and have coordination and monitoring mechanisms been defined? - Have the roles (contributions and responsibilities) of other actors involved in the implementation been defined? -Do the earmarked organisations have the required capacities to implement the policy/strategy/action plan?</p>	<p>- What improvements could be made in the institutional framework in order to facilitate its implementation and effectiveness? - What can be done to further enhance the availability and quality of required human resources?</p>
<p>The financial resources made available to implement and monitor the policy/strategy/action plan</p>	<p>- Have sources of financing been clearly identified and assigned, and a timeframe defined to implement, coordinate and monitor the policy/strategy/action plan?</p>	<p>- What improvements could be made in the financing of the policy/strategy/action plan to enhance its effectivity and/or efficiency?</p>

Data analysis/calculation of the indicator

Based on the scoring and further (disaggregated) information provided, participants in the monitoring/review meeting may identify gaps or areas for strengthening or improvement:

- How can the existing food strategy/policy/action plan be better implemented, funded and communicated?
- What changes in the existing strategy/policy/action plan are proposed? Or what steps can be taken to elaborate such strategy/policy or action plan?
- What is the likelihood of success of the proposed changes?
- What process should be followed to implement these changes? Steps to be taken? Stakeholders to be involved? Critical time-lines? Resources required?
- Which lobbying strategies should be put in place, by whom and when?

The self-assessment exercise can be repeated once a year to monitor uptake of agreed improvements/changes.



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations



Milan Urban Food Policy Pact Monitoring Framework

July 2018 version

Indicator 4: Presence of an inventory of local food initiatives and practices to guide development and expansion of municipal urban food policy and programmes

MUFPP framework of actions' category: Governance

The indicator allows for (self) assessment of the presence and use of an inventory of local food initiatives and practices to guide development and expansion of municipal urban food policy and programmes. It may spur new development or actualisation of such inventory and define recommendations for better use.

Overview table

MUFPP Work stream	Governance- Ensuring an enabling environment for effective action
MUFPP action	Identify, map and evaluate local initiatives and civil society food movements in order to transform best practices into relevant programmes and policies, with the support of local research or academic institutions
What the indicator measures	The indicator allows for (self) assessment of the presence (yes/no) and use of an inventory of local food initiatives and practices (using a simple scoring sheet) to guide development and expansion of municipal urban food policy and programmes. It may spur new development or actualisation of such inventory and define recommendations for better use.
Which variables need to be measured / what data are needed	Information is collected and analysed on Presence of an inventory of local food initiatives and practices, its Use, Budget and Open accessibility.
Unit of measurement <i>(i.e. Percentages, averages, number of people, etc.)</i>	Metrics used include: -Amount of budget available -Number (and type) of users of the inventory
Unit(s) of Analysis <i>(i.e people under 5 years old, etc.)</i>	Different user groups can be distinguished: decision-makers, technical staff in different municipal or government sectors and programmes, various non-governmental stakeholders.
Possible sources of information of such data	Self-assessment among stakeholders involved in urban food policies/strategies/action plans (including those participating in an

	interdepartmental coordinating or multi-stakeholder food body). Possibly validated by assessment of external actors.
Possible methods/tools for data-collection	-Group discussion for self-assessment, most likely the cheapest approach -Key informants interviews -User surveys
Expertise required	No specific expertise required
Resources required/ estimated costs for monitoring	The (self) assessment will not require a large amount of funding. It can for example be implemented during a meeting of an interdepartmental coordinating or multi-stakeholder food policy and planning body if these exist. Note however that development of the inventory itself and keeping it up-to-date requires sufficient financial and human resources.
Specific observations	The Milan Urban Food Policy Pact has developed a format for best practice inventory and documentation ¹ . Documented practices are made accessible on the Urban Food Action Platform and can inspire other cities to start collating local food initiatives.
Examples of application	

Rationale/evidence

In many cities there is already a breadth of food policy and programmatic work occurring, implemented by government programmes, civil society organisations, local and international NGOs, research organisations and universities. Concrete examples of practices, that include enough detail and direction to inform follow up, can be used then as a source of inspiration to develop or expand urban food programmes and policies or to adapt new policy and practice.

The Milan Urban Food Policy Pact promotes identification, documentation and sharing of good practices or policies originating in a city from either civil society, other stakeholders or from municipal government that has demonstrated results that are significant in relation to the commitments of the Pact and fit into the Framework for Action. They collect, systematise and disseminate best practices by various means (Best Practice books, database, Mayor's Summit, city-to-city exchange) in supports of cities' efforts to strengthen their urban food systems. Annex 1 provides the format for their Best Practice Inventory.

Similarly at local level, urban food practice or policy innovation can be sped up, by not having to be invented from scratch, and can lead to improvements through adaptation over time.

Cities who have not yet done so would benefit from carrying out a comprehensive inventory of relevant food system activities developed in their territory. Cities who already have such inventory, may need to ensure that it is regularly updated over time, that it is widely made available among different stakeholders and that the inventory is used to further build or review a comprehensive urban food policy/strategy or programmes. Local NGOs or research organisations may be funded to carry out the identification, mapping and evaluation of local food initiatives, practices and policies.

In many cases, information may be available in individual institutions, but is not assembled and brought together in one place.

It is important to note that mere presence of such best practice inventory is not sufficient. The degree to which such inventory is up-to-date and used will determine the extent to which it will help transform

¹ Forster T., Egal, F., Getz-Escudero A., Dubbeling, M. and H. Renting, 2015. Milan Urban Food Policy Pact-Selected good practices from cities. Fondazione Giangiacomo Feltrinelli. <http://www.milanurbanfoodpolicypact.org/good-practices/>

and scale up the “best” practices into relevant programmes and policies. This would imply the formal adoption of such best practices/policies by the municipal government.

Making an inventory of local practices and policies publically available will also allow non-governmental stakeholders to use and benefit from it.

Glossary/concepts/definitions used

A practice or policy is an intervention in the form of an initiative, campaign, policy or programme originating in a city from either civil society or from municipal government that has demonstrated results that are significant in relation to the development or improvement of an urban food strategy/policy or action plan.

Preparations

For the self-assessment:

1. In case an inventory of local food policies and practices exists: organisation of a meeting with different stakeholders involved in the formulation and implementation of urban food strategies/policies/action projects. During this meeting one or all governance related indicators (1-6) could be jointly discussed. The respective monitoring guidelines can be shared with all involved prior to the meeting.
2. In case such inventory does not exist: the indicator can be reported on by the contact person in the city for urban food policies and the Milan Pact. The exercise may contribute to a (future) reflection and planning process on the importance, role and set up of such inventory.
3. The (self) assessment can be validated with selected external stakeholders, specifically to get their views on use and accessibility of information. Alternatively or in addition a user survey could be implemented to get information on type of users, frequency of use, what the information was used for and how use of the information supported project or policy design and review.

In case other evaluations methods are selected (key informant interviews, user survey) respective preparations should be taken.

Sampling

Preferably all –as many as possible- stakeholders involved in the formulation and implementation of urban food policies/strategies/ projects should participate in the monitoring exercise.

In addition, a randomly sampled number of external stakeholders not participating in the design and implementation of urban food policies/strategies/ projects and/or of potential users of the inventory could be asked if they are aware of the existence of an inventory and if they have ever accessed/used it.

Data collection and data disaggregation

During a monitoring/review meeting the following scoring sheet and table can be discussed and filled. Specific observations made during the meeting can be added in the final column. Also recommendations for improvement can be added here.

Scoring sheet

Characteristics	Scoring			Total score	Disaggregation of information	Observations/ Recommendations
Presence of an (up-to-date) inventory of local food initiatives and practices to guide development and expansion of municipal urban food policy and programmes	Yes= 1 point	No= 0 points			Indicate where the inventory is located, when it was developed and what it contains	
Level of use: is the inventory used to guide development and expansion of municipal urban food policy and programmes?	Yes, frequent use =2 points	Partially or occasionally= 1 point	No= 0 points		Indicate how it is used and reasons for partial or non-implementation	
					Lessons learned/recommendations for more effective use	
Budget available- A specific budget for developing and up-dating the inventory is made available by the city to local NGOs/research institutes	Yes= 1 point	No= 0 points			Budget amount available and form of collaboration with civil society/research	
Accessibility: The inventory is publicly accessible for use by any governmental or non-governmental stakeholder	Yes= 1 point	No= 0 points			Number and types of users; if available information on how they used the inventory	
Total score:						

Data analysis/calculation of the indicator

Based on the scoring and further (disaggregated) information provided, participants in the monitoring/review meeting may identify actions to be undertaken for developing and up-dating the inventory and/or for enhancing its use.

Annex 1: Template to report a practice - Milan Urban Food Policy Pact

Organisation	
Contact person(s)	
Selected practice (short title)	
Period/duration	
Summary of actions carried out (including policy interventions or campaigns)	

Actors involved in the practice or policy (mayoral initiative, city council, civil society, private sector, etc.)	
<u>Most important</u> outcomes or lessons	
References to documents and websites (links for further information)	



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations



Milan Urban Food Policy Pact Monitoring Framework

July 2018 version

Indicator 5: Presence of a mechanism for assembling and analysing urban food system data to monitor/evaluate and inform municipal policy making on urban food policies.

MUFPP framework of actions' category: Governance

The indicator allows for (self) assessment of the presence and use of a monitoring/evaluation mechanisms for assembling and analysing urban food system data. Actual monitoring/evaluation will enable reflection on the experiences gained with urban food policies, impacts achieved and will inform and improve further municipal food policy making and reporting.

Overview table

MUFPP Work stream	Governance- Ensuring an enabling environment for effective action
MUFPP actions	Develop or improve multi-sectoral information systems for policy development and accountability by enhancing the availability, quality, quantity, coverage and management and exchange of data related to urban food systems, including both primary data collection, and secondary data generated by civil society and other partners.
What the indicator measures	The indicator allows for (self) assessment of the presence and use of a monitoring/evaluation mechanisms for assembling and analysing urban food system data. Actual monitoring/evaluation will enable reflection on the experiences gained with urban food policies, impacts achieved and will inform and improve further municipal food policy making and reporting.
Which variables need to be measured / what data are needed	Presence of a monitoring/evaluation mechanism (yes/no); Form and use of the monitoring/evaluation mechanism (with use of a scoring sheet).
Unit of measurement <i>(i.e. Percentages, averages, number of people, etc.)</i>	Metrics used: -Type of data and information collected; - Use there-off; -Type and level of data disaggregation; -Stakeholders responsible for data collection; -Data accessibility.

	Note that for actual data collection and analysis on the urban food system/policy, the entire set of indicators provided under the Milan Urban Food Policy Pact Monitoring Framework can be used.
Unit(s) of Analysis (i.e people under 5 years old, etc.)	In terms of users of the information, different user groups and stakeholders can be distinguished.
Possible sources of information of such data	Self-assessment among stakeholders involved in urban food policies/strategies/action plans (including those participating in an interdepartmental coordinating or multi-stakeholder food body). Possibly validated by assessment of external actors.
Possible methods/tools for data-collection	-Group discussion for self-assessment, most likely the cheapest approach -Key informants interviews -User surveys Note: For actual data collection and analysis a large variety of secondary and primary research tools can be applied.
Expertise required	Experience with process and impact monitoring is required for actual urban food system assessment, data collection and analysis.
Resources required/estimated costs	The (self) assessment will not require a large amount of funding. It can for example be implemented during a meeting of an interdepartmental coordinating or multi-stakeholder food policy and planning body if these exist. Note that implementation of actual urban food system monitoring, data collection and analysis requires high amounts of staff time and resources. Development of a comprehensive food system assessment may costs from USD 50,000-150,000 depending on existing data availability and the set scope of the assessment and evaluation.
Specific observations	
Examples of application	The Municipality of Curitiba, Brazil has a Municipal Plan of Food and Nutrition Security (http://multimedia.curitiba.pr.gov.br/2017/00188887.pdf or http://www.curitiba.pr.gov.br/conteudo/1-plano-municipal-de-seguranca-alimentar-e-nutricional/2809) which includes goals and indicators for various actions related to food and nutritional security. Separate work and monitoring sheets (derived from the Municipal Plan for Food and Nutrition Security) are designed for each of the involved municipal organs or programmes that interface with food and nutritional security. Data collected are also discussed in the Municipal Council for Food and Nutrition Security for monitoring and decision making.

Rationale/evidence

Any food policy development process should be based on a thorough assessment of the current urban food system in the city and ongoing trends. This requires collection of food system data (e.g. on food consumption, production, employment in the food system, nutrition, food supply sources etc.) and analysis of these data *to design food-related policy and programmes*. Such assessment will provide appropriate information to the various stakeholders to enter into dialogue, facilitate joint goal setting and strategic action planning and establish baseline data and indicators for monitoring and evaluation. Assessments of the urban food system can be undertaken in various ways (e.g. rapid mainly qualitative appraisal versus more systematic data gathering including statistically representative quantitative data), using a variety of methods (e.g. review of available research data and available statistics, GIS mapping, key informants, focus group interviews, community food mapping, and use of surveys)¹.

Policy monitoring/evaluation also requires the setting of measurable goals and targets to allow *for policy revision and reporting*. A large number of food policies or programmes reviewed by Baker and

¹ See for a toolkit on city region food system assessment and mapping work done by FAO and RUAF: <http://www.fao.org/in-action/food-for-cities-programme/toolkit/introduction/en/>

de Zeeuw (2015) do not contain measurable goals, which makes it difficult to monitor to what extent the expected changes in the urban food system are realised².

It is acknowledged that impact monitoring is a complex and costly task (e.g., How to filter out other influences on the urban food system?). Costs and relevance of impact monitoring should therefore be balanced with process and progress monitoring. For example, if we know that education and training are key to both lowering GHG emissions and improving health outcomes, it may make more sense to monitor a number of activities, resources, partners etc. engaged in education and training, instead of actually monitoring GHG emissions which is a quite difficult and costly process.

Any monitoring should therefore ideally encompass both *food policy formulation and implementation process* (approach/ methods applied, inter-institutional cooperation, civic participation, etc.), *progress* (activities implemented and outputs realised), as well as *the (social, environmental, economic) impacts obtained*: the degree of realisation of the desired changes in the urban food system as a result of the interventions, as well as unintended impacts.

Following such reasoning, the City of Milan established in 2017 a set of Food Policy Guidelines that identify the need to develop a monitoring system for the food policy itself, as well for the impacts of the food policy on the food system. The Toronto Food Strategy developed a monitoring matrix for Food Policy Analysis: it analysed each project and presented overlapping themes for food systems change. So far key impact indicators on poverty, health, etc. are not used as this diverts too much energy and resources from other projects. In specific cases, monitoring is done at project specific level.

Ideally, *data collected will be disaggregated* for different income groups and spatial levels (different areas in the city; urban/rural areas). Spatial location of data for example will allow to geographically link specific indicator data to specific areas in the city as a basis for further planning. It is important to note that data collected might be local government data, but could also *include information and data collected by community organisations, NGOs or academic institutions* that pertain to the city overall. To get a more objective view on the effects of the actions undertaken in the context of the implementation of an urban food policy/strategy, it may be even necessary to ask an independent research institute to periodically assess the changes in the urban food system applying the targets and indicators set in the policy or strategy. That means that it is important to distinguish "city as geography" and "city as government". Both are relevant here.

Finally, data collected should be *made available to the public domain*, for reasons of accountability. Multi-stakeholder participation in data analysis and policy design and review will enhance inclusiveness and efficiency gains (see further Indicator 2 *Presence of an active multi-stakeholder food policy and planning structure*).

Glossary/concepts/definitions used

Cities use different food **monitoring/evaluation mechanisms**:

- Ede Municipality (the Netherlands) for example reports on the individual food programme objectives via a **dashboard**. Dashboards provide at-a-glance views of data and indicators. The dashboard is often displayed on a web page which is linked to a database that allows the report to be constantly updated.
- As indicated, the Municipality of Curitiba uses a set of **monitoring sheets**.

² Baker L. and H. de Zeeuw, 2015. Urban food policies and programmes. In: Drechsel and De Zeeuw (ed). Cities and agriculture-Developing resilient urban food systems, 2015. Earthscan-Routledge London and New York. <http://www.ruaf.org/urban-food-policies-and-programmes-overview>.

- RUAF and FAO developed a [City Region Food System Indicator Framework](#)³. The City Region Food System indicator framework is a practical assessment and planning tool designed to help cities to (1) Assess the current status and performance of a city region food system following a whole-system approach; (2) Identify priority areas for action with clear desired outcomes and ways of measuring change; (3) Help with planning strategy and action to achieving the desired outcomes; and (4) Establish baselines and monitor changes resulting from (future) policy and programme implementation.
- The UK Sustainable Cities Network developed a **monitoring toolbox**⁴ that has two main purposes. The first is to provide local authorities and policy makers in the UK with a clear, robust and comprehensive collation of relevant evidence and indicators of success of a place-based approach to food. The second is to help both existing and interested ‘practitioners’ to plan, implement, monitor and evaluate the impact of their Sustainable Food Cities programmes. For this purpose, a common framework and approach that is sufficiently flexible to account for differing local circumstances and priorities was developed.
- This methodological guideline is part of the **Milan Urban Food Policy Pact Indicator Framework** that can be applied by cities to monitor implementation and outcomes related to the Milan Pact Voluntary Framework of Action.

Preparations

For the self-assessment:

1. In case a monitoring/evaluation mechanism exists: organisation of a meeting with different stakeholders involved in collection and analysis of urban food system data. The monitoring guidelines can be shared with all involved prior to the meeting.
2. In case such monitoring/evaluation mechanism does not exist: the indicator can be reported on by the contact person in the city for urban food policies and the Milan Pact. The exercise may contribute to a (future) reflection and planning process on the importance, role and set up of such mechanism.
3. The (self) assessment can be validated with selected external stakeholders, specifically to get their views on use and accessibility of information. Alternatively or in addition a user survey could be implemented to get information on type of users, frequency of use, what the information was used for and how use of the information supported project or policy design and review.

In case other evaluations methods are selected (key informant interviews, user survey) respective preparations should be taken.

Sampling

Preferably all –as many as possible- stakeholders involved in urban food system data collection, analysis, monitoring and evaluation should participate in the monitoring exercise.

³ This City Region Food System Indicator Framework is part of the City Region Food Systems (CRFS) toolkit to assess and plan sustainable city region food systems. The toolkit has been developed by FAO, RUAF Foundation and Wilfrid Laurier University.

⁴ Prosperi, P.; Moragues-Faus, A.; Sonnino, R. and Devereux, C. (2015) Measuring progress towards sustainable food cities: Sustainability and food security indicators. Report of the ESRC financed Project “Enhancing the Impact of Sustainable Urban Food Strategies”. Access: <http://sustainablefoodcities.org/getstarted/developingindicators>

In addition, a randomly sampled number of external stakeholders and/or of potential users of the inventory could be asked if they are aware of the existence of such monitoring/evaluation mechanisms and if they have ever accessed/used it.

Data collection and data disaggregation

During a monitoring/review meeting the following table can be discussed and filled. Specific observations made during the meeting can be added in the final column. Also recommendations for improvement can be added here.

Scoring sheet

Characteristics	Scoring			Total score	Disaggregation of information	Observations/Recommendations
	Yes= 1 point	No= 0 points				
Presence of a monitoring/evaluation mechanism for assembling and analysing urban food system data to inform municipal policy making on urban food policies.					Describe the mechanism and what it is used for (e.g. design of policies, monitoring and revision of policies and programmes, reporting, resource negotiations)	
The monitoring/evaluation mechanism monitors the food policy formulation and implementation process (approach/methods applied, inter-institutional cooperation, civic participation, etc.)	Yes in a comprehensive way= 2 points	Partially = 1 point	No = 0 points		Type of data collected and tools used	
The monitoring/evaluation mechanism monitors the food policy formulation and implementation progress (activities implemented and outputs realised)	Yes in a comprehensive way= 2 points	Partially = 1 point	No = 0 points		Type of data collected and tools used	
The monitoring/evaluation mechanism monitors the (social, environmental, economic) impacts obtained as a result of food interventions	Yes in a comprehensive way= 2 points	Partially = 1 point	No = 0 points		Type of data collected and tools used	
Information and data collected are disaggregated	Yes, for all data and variables= 2 points	Partially = 1 point	No = 0 points		Type and level of data disaggregation	
Use is made of data and information collected by different stakeholders (government, NGOs, research, private sector)	Yes, full use of information by several stakeholders =2 points	Partial use or only a limited number of stakeholders = 1 point	No = 0 points		What stakeholders are using which data and in what way?	

Monitoring/evaluation data are freely accessible in the public domain	Yes for all data and all stakeholders= 2 points	Partially = 1 point	No = 0 points		Analysis of what data are accessible, where /how, at what costs and to whom	
Monitoring/evaluation data are fed back into multi-stakeholder policy planning and review	Yes, fully= 2 points	Partially = 1 point	No = 0 points		Describe what data are used, how and how this impacts policy planning and review	
Total score:						

Data analysis/calculation of the indicator

Based on the scoring and further (disaggregated) information provided, recommendations for strengthening or improving mechanism for assembling and analysing urban food system data. Preferably, such action plan would be developed in the same or a following meeting of stakeholders involved, during which each of the members confirm their commitments and agree on concrete actions. The self-assessment exercise can be repeated once a year to monitor uptake of agreed improvements/changes.

Results of actual assessments and monitoring/evaluation can be used by the local government as well as other stakeholders engaged in the urban food system to design, review and improve their policies and programmes. Making data available to decision-makers and budget-holders will support lobbying and negotiations for resource allocations.



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations



Milan Urban Food Policy Pact Monitoring Framework

July 2018 version

Indicator 6: Existence of a food supply emergency/food resilience management plan for the municipality (in response to disasters; vulnerabilities in food production, transport, access; socio economic shocks, etc.) based on vulnerability assessment

MUFPP framework of actions' category: Governance

The indicators allows for (self) assessment of the presence and level of implementation of a food supply emergency/ food resilience management plan. If desired, critical assessment of the actual plan itself may be implemented in addition. Both exercises help define areas for improvement.

Overview table

MUFFP Work stream	Governance- Ensuring an enabling environment for effective action
MUFFP action	Develop a disaster risk reduction strategy to enhance the resilience of urban food systems , including those cities most affected by climate change, protracted crises and chronic food insecurity in urban and rural areas
What the indicator measures	The indicators allows for (self) assessment of the presence and level of implementation of a food supply emergency / food resilience management plan. If desired, critical assessment of the actual plan itself may be implemented in addition. Both exercises help define areas for improvement.
Which variables need to be measured / what data are needed	Information is collected on Existence of a food emergency/resilience plan (yes/no), and –with use of a scoring sheet- on Vulnerability assessment and focus, Level of integration, Development of specific individual actions and Transparency. If a further in-depth critical assessment of the food emergency and resilience plan itself will be done, this requires information to be collected on Justification, Vision and Objectives, Policy measures and instruments, Targets and monitoring; Institutional framework and Financial resources.
Unit of measurement <i>(i.e. Percentages, averages, number of people, etc.)</i>	Metrics include: - Number (and type) of preparedness and management strategies proposed and implemented in the context of a comprehensive plan - Funding amounts (and budget sources) allocated

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number (and type) of target groups and specific actions proposed/taken - Number (and type) of individual actions
Unit(s) of Analysis <i>(i.e people under 5 years old, etc.)</i>	Specific target groups: income or socioeconomic wealth class, age, specific areas in the city, other specific groups
Possible sources of information of such data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Self-assessment among stakeholders involved in the food emergency/resilience plan (including those participating in an interdepartmental coordinating or multi-stakeholder food body). Possibly validated by assessment of external actors. -Minutes/reports on implementation and monitoring of the food emergency/resilience plan -External evaluation and study reports
Possible methods/tools for data-collection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Group discussion for self-assessment and analysis of the food emergency/resilience plan, most likely the cheapest approach -External evaluation -Ad hoc surveys to capture opinions of stakeholders and target groups -Key informants interviews
Expertise required	Expertise in vulnerability assessment and resilience planning
Resources required/estimated costs	The self-assessment assessment will not require a large amount of funding. It can for example be implemented during a meeting of an interdepartmental coordinating or multi-stakeholder food policy and planning body if these exist. The in-depth critical assessment of the food emergency/resilience plan itself requires specific effort and sufficient staff time.
Specific observations	
Examples of application	When the City of Baltimore (United States) experienced public unrest in 2015, it realised that its food system was vulnerable to disasters and shocks. It therefore commissioned a <i>Food System Resilience Advisory Report</i> to feed into its more general <i>Disaster Preparedness Plan</i> . The study, carried out by researchers from the Johns Hopkins Center for a Livable Future ¹ , provides a good methodology for any other city willing to investigate its food system's ability to recover from shocks.

Rationale/evidence

Cities and their urban food systems are also increasingly being affected by both acute shocks (such as floods, wind storms, disease outbreaks, supply disruptions, food price hikes, high influx of refugees) as well as chronic stresses (such as longer-term projected climate changes in climate patterns, uncontrolled urban growth or inefficiencies in systems to support production activities, chronic poverty and food shortages). The number of reported natural disasters affecting cities has significantly increased in recent decades: from 195 (1987-1998 average) to 365 per year (2000-2006 average)². Rapid urban growth will only increase the number of people living in highly vulnerable urban communities (IPCC fifth assessment report)³.

An increase in acute shocks and chronic stresses may impact food production, processing and distribution along the entire food supply chain, while also exacerbating food insecurity in urban areas. Food supplies, which are delivered just-in-time in many urban areas, are specifically vulnerable; as are

¹ Biehl, Erin; Buzogany, Sarah; Huang, Alice; Chodur, Gwen; Neff, Roni, 2017. Baltimore Food System Resilience Advisory Report. <https://www.jhsph.edu/research/centers-and-institutes/johns-hopkins-center-for-a-livable-future/pdf/projects/resilience/Baltimore-Resilience-Report.pdf>

² Hoyois P., Scheuren J-M., Below R., Guha-Sapir D., 2007. *Annual Statistical Review: Numbers and Trends*, 2006. Brussels: CRED, UCL, UNISDR, 54p.

³ IPCC, 2014. *Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Part A: Global and Sectoral Aspects*. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Field, C.B., V.R. Barros, D.J. Dokken, K.J. Mach, M.D. Mastrandrea, T.E. Bilir, M. Chatterjee, K.L. Ebi, Y.O. Estrada, R.C. Genova, B. Girma, E.S. Kissel, A.N. Levy, S. MacCracken, P.R. Mastrandrea, and L.L. White (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, 1132 pp.

urban groups that are already food insecure or that do not have sufficient assets and capacity to deal with food price hikes or supply disruptions. For example, increasing food prices resulting from food supply disruptions will directly impact consumers in urban areas because they are almost entirely dependent on purchasing (versus growing) their food. The hardest hit will be on vulnerable population who may already be food insecure.

To understand a city food system's ability to recover from shocks requires an assessment of how well its food system works now, its current vulnerabilities, and of the system's ability to bounce back. Potential vulnerabilities may involve food accessibility, availability and acceptability.

For instance, in Baltimore, 1 in 5 inhabitants is food insecure, meaning that they might not be able to stock food, and therefore to prepare for and recover from disruptions in the food supply system. Many residents do not live within walking distance of a supermarket, leaving them with no access to fresh food if for some reason, such as road disruptions, they cannot use their car or public transportation. Another challenge in Baltimore's current food system is labour shortage in transportation (more specifically in truck companies): if an event (for instance an epidemic) was to prevent workers to come to work, then it would be difficult to make up for it. One last example: the concentration of processing activities into big facilities makes it difficult for local food processors to survive. This is a local economic challenge, but it is also a resilience one, for if one big processor gets affected by an event (a storm, a power shortage, etc.), then it may be difficult for another local food processor to quickly take over⁴.

Based on a vulnerability assessment, a food supply emergency/ food resilience management plan can be developed. Such plans should build on opinions and views of representatives from all actors in the food system, as well as stakeholders who have on the ground experience of past disruptions or existing community actions. Food supply emergency/resilience management plans should not only be oriented at government interventions, but also at business interventions and community actions.

Experience shows that a successful food emergency/resilience plan:

- **Looks for synergies between actions that increase resilience and help tackle existing food system issues at the same time.** For instance, policies that target food insecurity will increase the amount of food households are able to store, and hence their ability to withstand a temporary disruption in supply.
- **Try to build in redundancy in the food system** to avoid being dependent on one single road, source of production, processing facility or provider.
- **Support actors that are less able to prepare for, or to withstand, an event** (such as for example small businesses and food insecure households)⁵.
- **Build in resilience into food planning, or food into resilience planning.**

⁴ Taken from: <http://www.urbanfoodfutures.com/how-resilient-is-your-food-system>

⁵ For instance, Baltimore is developing Resilience Hubs to make food and water accessible to households in one location in case of disaster.

Depending on the city, policy routes will be different. It is important to have a specific food emergency or resilience plan, but also to integrate food into other city planning and resilience strategies. For example, in October 2017, the Metropolitan District of Quito, Ecuador (MDQ) together with the Rockefeller Foundation's 100 Resilient Cities initiative published the city's [Resilience Strategy](#). Quito's food systems is characterized by specific vulnerabilities, including a high dependence on food imports (over 85%), weak food distribution systems and isolated vulnerable communities. Based on a vulnerability analysis, an action plan will be developed to enhance the availability and accessibility of diversified, safe and nutritious food to the entire population. The action plan will also seek to increase consumers' capacity, education and awareness on healthy diets and nutrition. Additional actions in the strategy include:

- The strengthening of Quito's urban agriculture programme, in terms of enhancing the quality and quantity of local food production and by facilitating more diversified market mechanisms; and
- The development of a programme on sustainable agricultural development in the peri-urban and rural areas. Sustainable and lower-emission production practices will be promoted, while at the same time promoting more decent labour conditions⁶.

Glossary/concepts/definitions used

Urban resilience is defined by the Rockefeller 100RC as "the capacity of individuals, communities, institutions, businesses, and systems within a city to survive, adapt, and grow no matter what kinds of chronic stresses and acute shocks they experience."

Resilient (urban) food systems contribute to the notion of sustainable food systems, where "Sustainability refers to engaging in practices that meet the resource needs of the present without compromising the needs of the future, whereas resilience refers to the ability of systems to survive, withstand and adapt to various shocks and stresses"⁷. A resilient food system is understood as: "A system that has the capacity over time to provide sufficient healthy, sustainable and fair food to all in the face of chronic stresses and acute shocks, including unforeseen circumstances. [...] A resilient food system is robust (it can withstand disturbances without losing food security), has redundancy (elements of the system are replaceable and can absorb the effects of stresses and shocks), is flexible, can quickly recover lost food security and can adapt to changing circumstances"⁸.

Acute shocks are sudden, sharp events that threaten a city, including: earthquakes, floods, disease outbreaks, terrorist attacks. **Chronic stresses** are slow moving disasters that weaken the fabric of a city. They include: longer-term climate changes (e.g. decreasing rainfall, increasing temperatures) high poverty and unemployment, overtaxed or inefficient public transportation system, endemic violence, chronic food and water shortages⁹.

According to Wikipedia, a **vulnerability assessment** is the process of identifying, quantifying, and prioritising (or ranking) the [vulnerabilities](#) in a system. Vulnerability from the perspective of [disaster management](#) means assessing the threats from potential hazards to the population and to infrastructure. A food system vulnerability could occur at any point from farm to fork, including pre-harvest production, processing, distribution, and retail sales.

⁶ For further information on Quito and some examples from other cities, please see The Urban Agriculture Magazine No34: Measuring Impact at: <http://www.ruaf.org/publications/magazines>

⁷ Charles L. Redman, "Should sustainability and resilience be combined or remain distinct pursuits?" Ecology and Society 19, no. 2 (2014): 37.

⁸ Carey R. et al. 2016. Melbourne's food future: Planning a resilient city foodbowl. A Foodprint Melbourne Report.

⁹ <http://www.100resilientcities.org/resources/>

A food emergency (response) plan or a food resilience management or disaster preparedness plan includes an identification of responses to identified and potential food system vulnerabilities: it identifies organisational and financial resources, determines roles and responsibilities, outlines policies and procedures and planning activities in order to reach a level of preparedness and respond timely and effectively to any acute shock/chronic stress that might occur. The plans do not apply to food incidents of a limited scope that are routinely handled by local or state health departments or other food agencies such as state agriculture departments. They apply to food emergencies that may involve a large number of people in a small area, or that are widespread, involving a number of localities in the city. In general, the scope of a food emergency will exceed the capacity of the entity or jurisdiction immediately responsible for responding.

Preparations

For the self-assessment:

1. In case a food emergency/resilience plan exists: organisation of a meeting with as many stakeholders as possible involved in the formulation and implementation of the food emergency and resilience plan. The monitoring guidelines can be shared with all involved prior to the meeting.
2. In case a food emergency/resilience plan does not exist: the indicator can be reported on by the contact person in the city for urban food policies and the Milan Pact. The exercise may contribute to a (future) reflection and planning process on the importance, role and set up of such a food emergency/resilience plan.
3. The (self) assessment can be validated with selected external stakeholders, also to get wider inputs on possible areas for improvement.

In case other evaluation methods are selected (external evaluation, key informant interviews) respective preparations should be taken.

Sampling

Preferably all –as many as possible- stakeholders involved in the formulation and implementation of the food emergency/resilience plan should participate in the monitoring exercise.

For the self-assessment: In addition, a randomly sampled number of external stakeholders not participating in the design and implementation of the food emergency/resilience plan could be asked if they are aware of the existence, content and results of a municipal food emergency/resilience plan (yes/no). Such questions could be included in a broader urban food-related survey.

Data collection and data disaggregation

During a monitoring/review meeting the following table can be discussed and filled. Specific observations made during the meeting can be added in the final column. Also recommendations for improvement can be added here.

Scoring sheet

Characteristics	Scoring		Total score	Disaggregation of information	Observations/ Recommendations
	Yes=1 point	No=0 points			
Existence of a food supply emergency/ food resilience management plan for the municipality				Add the strategy document and summarise its content	

					Number and type of preparedness and management strategies proposed and implemented	
The plan is based on a comprehensive vulnerability assessment of the urban food system	Yes, completely=2 points	Partially = 1 point	No= 0 points		Add the vulnerability assessment and summarise its content	
The plan identifies clear roles, responsibilities, resources and timelines	Yes, completely=2 points	Partially = 1 point	No= 0 points		-Budget sources and funding amounts allocated -Different stakeholders engaged and their assigned roles	
Vulnerability focus: the plan specifically takes into account the needs of and response actions for groups that are less able to prepare for/withstand shocks and stresses (e.g. small producers, food businesses, low income and food insecure households)	Yes, completely=2 points	Partially = 1 point	No= 0 points		Number and type of target groups and specific actions proposed/taken	
Level of integration: integration of food system components into other city planning and emergency/resilience disaster risk reduction strategies.	Yes, completely=2 points	Partially = 1 point	No= 0 points		Type of integration and into which strategies and documents	
Implementation of specific actions: In case of the absence of a full food emergency/resilience management plan, the city implements specific individual strategies/actions such as climate smart urban agriculture production systems, food business zoning away from flood zones, storage of food emergency supplies, etc.	Yes, a full set of actions=2 points	A partial set of actions= 1 point	No= 0 points		Number and type of individual actions	
Transparency: Information is widely shared within the city government, non-government stakeholders and with a larger general public on the existence, implementation and results/impacts of the food emergency/resilience plan	Yes, fully=2 points	Partially= 1 point	No= 0 points		Information and outreach mechanisms and target groups	
Total score:						

Note: If existing, it may be relevant to further critically assess the food emergency/resilience plan itself in order to highlight areas of improvements of the actual plan. The critical policy analysis proposed for Indicator 3 (*Presence of a municipal urban food policy or strategy and/or action plans*) may be used and adapted for this purpose.

Data analysis/calculation of the indicator

Based on the scoring and further (disaggregated) information provided, participants in the monitoring/review meeting may identify gaps or areas for strengthening or improvement, such as for example:

- How can the existing food emergency or resilience plan be better implemented, funded and communicated?
- How can proposed actions be better integrated in other policies and programmes?
- What changes in the existing food emergency or resilience plan are proposed? Or what steps can be taken to elaborate such plan?
- What is the likelihood of success of the proposed changes?
- What process should be followed to implement these changes? Steps to be taken? Stakeholders to be involved? Critical time-lines? Resources required?
- Which lobbying strategies should be put in place, by whom and when??

The self-assessment exercise can be repeated once a year to monitor uptake of agreed improvements/changes.

References and links to reports/tools

- **Baltimore:**

This report on food and climate resilience in Baltimore City identifies actions Baltimore can take to protect food security in the event of a natural or human-made disaster. As cities and food policy councils across the country consider how to manage threats from climate change, the report's findings highlight the importance of integrating food systems issues into disaster preparedness plans.

The report and a 2-page brief are available at:

Report: http://www.jhsph.edu/research/centers-and-institutes/johns-hopkins-center-for-a-livable-future/_pdf/projects/resilience/Baltimore-Resilience-Report.pdf

Brief: http://www.jhsph.edu/research/centers-and-institutes/johns-hopkins-center-for-a-livable-future/_pdf/projects/resilience/resilience-2-pager.pdf

- **Quito** [Resilience Strategy](#)