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Why working on an urban monitoring framework brings opportunities for cities?

➢ To facilitate the **design of policies** and initiatives by:
  - Creating an evidence base
  - Helping set priority areas
  - Defining target interventions
  - Monitoring progress made

➢ To mobilize **internal** and **external resources** for action

➢ To **communicate, share experiences** and lessons learnt
To recap: **What has been done so far? with who?**

- **Cities signed the MUFPP**
  - Oct. 2015
- **FAO – Milan joined forces**
- **2 surveys sent to cities**
  - July- Sep. 2016

- **Nov. 2015**
  - Some cities requested assistance to build an urban food monitoring process
- **Apr. 2016**
  - Expert consultation at FAO
- **Oct. 2016**
  - 2nd MUFPP gathering, at FAO
To recap: **What has been done so far? with who?** (ii)

Elaboration of a draft list of indicators

- **Nov. 2016 – June 2017**

1st webinar with a small group of cities

- **5th Oct. 2017**

3rd MUFPP gathering, Valencia

- **19 Oct. 2017**

Engagement of networks of local authorities

- **Aug. 2017**

Draft list of indicators shared with cities

- **Oct. 2017**
Where we are today and what we expect from this session

➢ All cities are informed about this process;

➢ All cities have an opportunity to express their needs;

➢ To gather feedback on the process;

➢ To gather feedback on the monitoring framework.
**What Next? - WorkPlan**

I. Oct. 2017, *Consolidation of inputs received* (written as well as from discussion);

II. Nov. 2017, *Organization of a 2nd webinar with cities* to consolidate the updated list of indicators;

III. Dec. 2017, *Organization of a 3rd webinar with cities* to receive inputs of tools and methodological, and discuss whether cities would like to have self-assessment tools within the final package;

IV. Jan. 2018, *Release of final list of indicators and methodological package* on how to use and collect data;
Which will be the final list of indicators?

- We will have a core set of indicators selected from the draft long list, complemented by additional indicators that cities may want to use on their convenience.

How will the final list of indicators be shortened?

- Scoring systems has been put in place – cities have been asked to rank each indicator according to relevance.
- Data availability.
What could be done after January 2018

• Feb. 2018, Piloting the monitoring framework (as a whole or some part of it);

• Identification of targets among piloting cities (short, medium and long-term).
.... Which *urban monitoring framework*?
The framework

- 6 workstreams
- Outcome areas
- 37 voluntary actions
- Proposed indicators (long list)
- Variables for data disaggregation
- Data sources
- Tools

Indicators still need to be reviewed
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MUFPP - Framework for Actions</th>
<th>Outcome areas</th>
<th>MUFPP – Recommended actions</th>
<th>Long list of indicators - to be reduced to a short list of core set indicators</th>
<th>Variables for disaggregation of data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring an enabling environment for effective action (governance)</td>
<td>Participatory food governance structures exist and are cross-jurisdictional, cross-sectorial and multi-stakeholder</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>1. [Improvement in] Presence of a (municipal) cross-sectoral interdepartmental body for advisory and decision making of food policies and programmes (i.e. food board)</td>
<td>Indicate the various government departments participating in such municipal body and examples of collaborative initiatives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Some examples: sustainable diets and nutrition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MUFPP - Framework for Actions</th>
<th>Outcome areas</th>
<th>MUFPP – Recommended actions</th>
<th>Long list of indicators - to be reduced to a short list of core set indicators</th>
<th>Variables for disaggregation of data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable diets and nutrition</td>
<td>Urban residents have access to affordable, sufficient, nutritious, safe, adequate, and diversified food that contribute to healthy diets and meet dietary needs</td>
<td>Promote sustainable diets.</td>
<td>17. [Increase in] Number of households consuming minimum 5 portions of fruits and vegetables per day</td>
<td>Differentiate where possible per income group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19. [Decrease in] Distance from household location to food retail outlets that sell fresh fruit &amp; vegetables</td>
<td>Differentiate where possible per income group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some examples: *social and economic equity*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MUFPP - Framework for Actions</th>
<th>Outcome areas</th>
<th>MUFPP – Recommended actions</th>
<th>Long list of indicators - to be reduced to a short list of core set indicators</th>
<th>Variables for disaggregation of data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social and economic equity</td>
<td>Increase in level of food security for specific vulnerable groups</td>
<td>Use cash and food transfers, and other forms of social protection systems to provide vulnerable populations with access to healthy food</td>
<td>34. [Decrease in] Percentage of people supported by food assistance and aid programmes <em>(see further indicators under sustainable diets and nutrition disaggregated for specific vulnerable groups)</em></td>
<td>Differentiate where possible per income group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some examples: **food production and rural-urban linkages**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MUFPP - Framework for Actions</th>
<th>Outcome areas</th>
<th>MUFPP – Recommended actions</th>
<th>Long list of indicators - to be reduced to a short list of core set indicators</th>
<th>Variables for disaggregatio n of data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Food production and rural-urban linkages | Efficient and diverse agricultural supply and value chains connect the city with food producers in the peri-urban and surrounding rural area providing access to a wide range of market opportunities | Support short food chains, producer organisations, producer-to-consumer networks and platforms. | 57. [Increase in] Economic value of locally produced food sold in the city (annual sales volume) | This can be measured for different market types e.g. farmers markets, [public sector food procurement etc.]
| | | | 58. [Increase in] Number of market opportunities available to local producers | Disaggregate numbers for different types of markets e.g. farmers markets, public markets, public sector food procurement, direct to consumers |
### Some examples: **food supply and distribution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MUFPP - Framework for Actions</th>
<th>Outcome areas</th>
<th>MUFPP – Recommended actions</th>
<th>Long list of indicators - to be reduced to a short list of core set indicators</th>
<th>Variables for disaggregation of data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food supply and distribution</strong></td>
<td><strong>Food policy and programmes</strong> &lt;br&gt;recognise and support the role of the informal food sector</td>
<td>Acknowledge the informal sector’s contribution to urban food systems.</td>
<td>84. [Increase in] <strong>Number of informal food workers that have received targeted training and support</strong></td>
<td>May differentiate for specific training/supp ort: e.g. on food safety</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Some examples: Food waste

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MUFPP - Framework for Actions</th>
<th>Outcome areas</th>
<th>MUFPP – Recommended actions</th>
<th>Long list of indicators - to be reduced to a short list of core set indicators</th>
<th>Variables for disaggregatio n of data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food loss and waste</strong></td>
<td><strong>Food loss and waste is reduced</strong> (or re-used) throughout the food system</td>
<td>Convene food system actors to assess and monitor food loss and waste reduction at all stages of the city region food supply chain.</td>
<td>85. [Decrease in] <strong>Total annual volume of food losses &amp; waste</strong></td>
<td>Differentiate at city level (e.g. public markets, school canteens etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Feedback from cities on the indicators framework

- Ghent
- Sao Paolo
- Toronto
- Washington
- Antananarivo
- Tirana
- Milan
- Quito
- Austin
- Funchal
- C40
Some examples of general feedback

• **Keep it flexible** to suit individual purposes. **Yet would be good to have a common narrative** built on common indicators across cities

• **Shorten the list** based on areas of common interest and ongoing data collection efforts

• **Reduce duplication**/combine indicators

• **Focus on local government interest** - “it should help us tell the story” – It should be food policy driven
Some examples of general feedback

- **Review coherence between some outcome areas**, recommended action and indicators

- **Focus on monitoring of impacts and quality of programmes** (on how we get things done), rather than on numbers (although more difficult to monitor)

- **Better specify level of data collection** (household, area, city, city-region)

- **Review workstream sustainable diets** (lack of environmental perspective; too narrowly focused on food security)
How to use the framework?

- Select your own indicators and build on ongoing data efforts where possible
- Relate indicators to policy targets
- Baseline and impact monitoring
- Build a common narrative among cities

Not aimed at comparing city performance among cities
Thank You for your attention and collaboration in this process!

For any questions: michela.carucci@fao.org
Where we are today and what we expect from this session

- All cities are informed about this process;
- All cities have an opportunity to express their needs;
- To gather feedback on the process;
- To gather feedback on the indicators framework.
Open questions

• Final output of this process: core set of indicators, plus complementary list of indicators that cities might use on their convenience. Do cities agree on that?

• Would some cities be interested in piloting this monitoring framework (as whole or some part of it) after January 2018?

• Which technical assistance is needed after January 2018?