



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations



Milan Urban Food Policy Pact Monitoring Framework

Draft version, July 2018

Indicator 26: Presence of municipal policies and regulations that allow and promote agriculture production and processing in the municipal area

MUFPP framework of actions' category: Food production

The indicator assesses the presence of supportive municipal policies and regulation that allow and promote urban and peri-urban agriculture production and processing. It will help define gaps or areas for improvement by revising/formulating new policies and regulations.

Overview table

MUFFP Work stream	Food production
MUFFP action	<p>Promote and strengthen urban and peri-urban food production and processing based on sustainable approaches and integrate urban and peri-urban agriculture into city resilience plans.</p> <p>Protect and enable secure access and tenure to land for sustainable food production in urban and peri-urban areas, including land for community gardeners and smallholder producers, for example through land banks or community land trusts; provide access to municipal land for local agricultural production and promote integration with land use and city development plans and programmes.</p>
What the indicator measures	<p>The indicator assesses the presence of supportive municipal policies and regulation that allow and promote urban and peri-urban agriculture production and processing. It will help define gaps or areas for improvement by revising/formulating new policies and regulations.</p> <p>Note that the mere presence of policies in itself will not enhance urban and peri-urban agriculture production and processing if such policies are not implemented or enforced.</p>
Which variables need to be measured / what data are needed	<p>Information to be collected on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Number and type of policies and regulations, -Level of implementation and enforcement, and -Information and communication.

Unit of measurement (i.e. Percentages, averages, number, etc.)	Metrics include: -Number (and types) of policies and regulations -Number (and types) of information and communication mechanisms and target groups
Unit(s) of Analysis	-Urban and peri-urban agriculture production units/enterprises -Urban and peri-urban agriculture processing units/enterprises
Possible sources of information of such data	-Self-assessment among representatives participating in the coordination body. Possibly validated by assessment of external actors. -Policy review and analysis (relevant government departments including agriculture, land use and planning, legal office, food safety, health, economic development. Previous research).
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	Policy formulation
Resources required/ estimated costs	
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 revision and improvement of the municipal policies. Furthermore, collecting and analysis of information done collectively contributes to a capacity development process.
Examples of application	London (UK) incorporated urban agriculture in the London Development Plan which commits the city to support urban agriculture especially in locations near food-insecure and vulnerable urban communities, and obliges local authorities to include space for urban agriculture in local spatial planning (London Assembly 2010). Dar es Salaam (Tanzania) accepted urban agriculture (crop and livestock) as a major urban land use and included urban agriculture in land use zoning and the Strategic Urban Development Plan. Baltimore (USA) adapted its zoning regulations and included commercial urban agriculture as a conditional permanent land use category (urban agriculture defined as the cultivation, processing and marketing of food within the city: horticulture, animal husbandry, aquaculture, agro-forestry, vineyards and wineries). Minneapolis (USA) supports affordable land ownership and/or affordable long-term leases for small enterprise urban agriculture on various types of land and rooftops (Minneapolis-DHFS 2009). It also established a food business development centre that provides start-up funds, such as low-interest matching loans, and access to technical assistance tailored to starting entrepreneurs and cooperative food initiatives ¹ .

Rationale/evidence

The UN Habitat New Urban Agenda (October 2016) emphasises the need for cities to ‘strengthen food system planning’ and recognises that dependence on distant sources of food and other resources can create sustainability challenges and vulnerabilities to supply disruptions. The agenda includes a commitment to: ‘Support urban agriculture and farming, in order to build a more localised food system...’.

In the same line, the City of Milan under its Food Policy Priority n°1: Guaranteeing healthy food for everybody, Guideline 1.3 states that: “The Municipality shall actively work to promote and facilitate various forms of urban agriculture and horticulture, as well as the establishment and consolidation of

¹ 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>.

networks and activities for creating social inclusion and providing food to the vulnerable population". Under Priority n°2: Promote the sustainability of the food system, Guideline 2.1 it states that: "The Municipality shall facilitate access to land through its institutional instruments, the co-promotion of specific services (e.g. mortgage credit, local land trusts, public lands, etc.) and the spread of multi-functional agriculture that contribute to the objectives set out here".²

Commercial urban and peri-urban agriculture production and the development of various types of commercial to social urban and peri-urban agriculture enterprises offer (new) opportunities for job and revenue creation for different actors in the food chain. Innovations are found in the development of new catering concepts (e.g. a restaurant or food shop using produce from the region), new product concepts (e.g. local product varieties or recipes) and new production-marketing concepts (e.g. restaurants growing part of their own food and urban farms selling produce on-farm).

Public policy can encourage such entrepreneurs through financial and public policy support. City governments can use a variety of policy and support instruments that focus on enabling affordable access to land, infrastructure, training and technical assistance, incubation funding and network creation to establish appropriate linkages with relevant public, private and civic societal actors. Communication and education, direct implementation or support to urban and peri-urban agriculture projects (production and/or processing) and provision of business support services (including granting access to land, markets, infrastructure and resources, but also encompassing training and advice) are complementary strategies delivered by many of these governments. These include legal and regulatory instruments, such as setting of procurement standards and targets (as done in Rome, Malmo and Ecuador), 'green' building regulations, zoning and agricultural land protection (as done in Toronto, Rosario and Belo Horizonte). Cities can enable access to or temporary use of public or private land and actively protect agricultural and open land for food production through land use zoning. Food growing areas, such as rooftop growing, community gardens, allotment gardens, can be made mandatory in new or renovated housing settlements and building projects. They also include financial instruments (like public or public-private investment funds, taxes and subsidies). The Toronto Enterprise Fund for example is a unique funding partnership between a not-for-profit network of community organisations and three levels of government. It supports and finances 'social enterprises'. Brasilia FD (Brazil) operated the PROVE programme that assisted urban producer groups to establish value adding enterprises by providing organisational and legal support, land, infrastructure, technical and business development advice and marketing support (e.g. establishing brands, farmers markets). Public investment in food transport and storage, marketing, waste management and provision may further stimulate urban food system enterprises development³.

As for any policy and regulation, level of implementation and enforcement will determine actual effectiveness. Information and communication on the policies and regulations are also key in this regard.

² Milan 2015-2020 food policy guidelines

<http://mediagallery.comune.milano.it/cdm/objects/changeme:71638/datastreams/dataStream3943587268670669/content?1482924699146>

³ See footnote 1. See also: RUAF Foundation, 2015. SMEs and sustainable urban food provisioning. RUAF Foundation and SUPURBFOOD. <http://www.ruaf.org/publications/smes-and-sustainable-urban-food-provisioning> and Dubbeling M., J. Carey and K. Hochberg, 2016. The role of private sector in city region food systems. RUAF Foundation, F&BKN and IWMI/ WLE.

<http://www.ruaf.org/sites/default/files/Private%20sector%20engagement%20in%20city%20region%20food%20systems%20Analysis%20report-final%282%29.pdf>

Glossary/concepts/definitions used

A **policy** can be described as a course of action adopted by government (business or organisation) to induce certain changes in the decisions and behaviour of actors in that society in order to achieve certain goals⁴.

A policy is also defined as the sum total of government, economic or business actions, from signal of intent to final outcomes (Adapted from Understanding Public Policy. Theories and Issues, Paul Cairney)

A policy is a set of ideas or plans that is used as a basis for making decisions, especially in politics, economics, or business (Collins Dictionary).

A **regulation** is a law, rule, or other order prescribed by authority, especially to regulate conduct.

Municipal policy instruments. Cities have different policy instruments available including legal/regulatory, economic/financial, communicative/educative and urban design instruments.

- **Legal or regulatory instruments:** The logic underlying legal instruments is that actors (such as citizens or industries) can be forced to adopt a certain desired behaviour through legal norms and regulations (like norms, laws, bye-laws, ordinances, etc.) and that it is possible to control whether these actors adhere to the given rules and norms. Actors who do not adhere to the rules will be sanctioned. An alternative legal instrument to issuing general bye-laws, norms and regulations, is the contract or covenant. The government and certain actors sign an agreement in which the social actors (e.g. urban farmers' organisations) agree to adhere voluntarily to certain norms and regulations, often in exchange for certain support by local government or other organisation (e.g. access to municipal land, obtaining a license for processing, technical support, etc.).
- **Economic/financial instruments:** The logic behind the application of economic instruments is the assumption that social actors will adopt a certain desired behaviour if this gives them some economic gains (or losses if they continue with the undesired behaviour). Local governments for example may grant tax incentives or subsidies if actors adopt the desired behaviour or levy special taxes for undesired behaviour (similar to the levy on cigarettes or alcohol). Such economic instruments also need a legal basis (see above), but the essential element here is not the law itself but the economic incentive or loss that orients (or is supposed to orient) a certain behaviour.
- **Communicative/educative instruments:** The assumption behind the use of communicative/educative types of instruments is that people will adopt a certain desired behaviour if they are well informed about the positive effects of the desired behaviour as well as the negative effects of the undesired behaviour. Accordingly, information, education and persuasion tools (media programmes, extension visits, training courses, leaflets, websites, etc.) will be applied to make people understand the importance of the desired change and to assist them in the change process. Related to urban agriculture, a municipality may provide technical training to urban producers and processing enterprises. Communicative/educative instruments are often used complementary to the other policy instruments mentioned, since the lack of an adequate communication and education strategy may strongly reduce the effectiveness of the other policy instruments used.

⁴ See footnote 1.

- **Urban design instruments:** The logic behind urban design instruments is that actors will adopt a certain desired behaviour if their physical environment has been designed in such a way that they are more or less automatically prompted to act a certain way: for example if public dustbins are widely available, generally people will throw less waste on the street. Examples related to urban agriculture are zoning (setting aside and protecting certain areas of the city for agriculture), combining or separating certain land uses depending on the degree of conflict/synergy, inclusion of space for home or community gardening in social housing projects, etc. Several cities have included land designated for urban agriculture in their urban land use plan, housing or in slum upgrading projects.

Urban and peri-urban agriculture enterprises engaged in production or processing include organisations that have a core strategy and mission to engage in economic, entrepreneurial activities through the production of goods, provision of services and/or marketing in the food system. It excludes non-governmental organisations, governments and civil society organisations.

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 and if an interdepartmental coordinating or multistakeholder food body exist: Preferably all representatives in the coordinating body should participate in the monitoring exercise. They should collectively fill in the scoring sheet provided below.

In case such body does not exist: representatives from all relevant government departments, e.g. agriculture, land use and planning, legal office, food safety, health, economic development should be involved.

In addition, a randomly sampled number of external stakeholders (NGOs and academic organisations working in urban and peri-urban agriculture and enterprise development) and target groups (producers and processors) could be engaged in a participatory analysis of existing policy instruments, gaps and opportunities/needs for improvement.

Data collection and data disaggregation

During a monitoring/review meeting the following scoring sheet can be discussed and filled. Individual members may first want to make their own assessment before discussing this in a larger group. Alternatively, a facilitator could guide group discussion from the start and facilitate the 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 scoring			Total score	Disaggregation of information	Specific observations/recommendations
Presence of municipal policies and regulations that allow and promote urban and peri-urban agriculture production and processing	Yes =1 point	No=0 points			-Number and type of policies and regulations -Add the policy documents and summarise their content -Distinguish for different types of polices	
Level of implementation: is the municipal policy/implementation actually implemented or enforced?	Yes, completely = 2 points	Partially = 1 point	No= 0 points		-Discuss for each of the policies or regulations. -Indicate reasons for partial or non-implementation -Indicate what stakeholders are (or should in future be) engaged in implementation	
Information and communication: Information and communication on the (various) policies and regulations is widely shared within the city government and potential beneficiaries	Yes, completely = 2 points	Partially = 1 point	No= 0 points		Number and type of information and communication mechanisms and target groups	

Note: It may be relevant to further critically assess the one or more municipal policies themselves in order to highlight areas of improvements of the actual policy. The analysis table provided in the guidelines for Indicator 3 *Presence of an urban food policy, strategy or action plan* may be used as a framework to do so.

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 policies be better implemented, funded and communicated?
- What changes in the existing policies are proposed? Or what steps can be taken to elaborate a new policy?
- 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

Godoy Garraza, G. y M. Manzoni, 2012. Agricultura familiar y acceso a la tierra urbana y periurbana : marco normativo y estrategias jurídicas. 1a ed. - Jujuy : Ediciones INTA, 2Argentina. Report accessible in Spanish from: <https://inta.gob.ar/documentos/agricultura-familiar-y-acceso-a-la-tierra-y-urbana-y-periurbana>