Milan Urban Food Policy Pact Monitoring Framework

Draft version, July 2018

> **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

MUFFP Work stream	Governance- Ensuring an enabling environment for effective action
MUFFP 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.e. Percentages, averages, number of people, etc.)*	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

(i.e people under 5 years old, etc.)	
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/ Recommenda tions
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 so[1]:

---

[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)	- 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?	- 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	- 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?	- 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	-W**hat 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?	- 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	-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?	-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?

The **institutional framework** for the operationalisation, implementation and monitoring of the policy/strategy/action plan	- 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?	- 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?
The financial resources made available to **implement and monitor** the policy/strategy/action plan	- Have **sources of financing** been clearly identified and assigned, and a **timeframe** defined to implement, coordinate and monitor the policy/strategy/action plan?	- What improvements could be made in the financing of the policy/strategy/action plan to enhance its effectivity and/or efficiency?

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.