



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.e. Percentages, averages, number of people, etc.) | Not applicable. This indicator will be assessed in a qualitative way. |
| Unit(s) of Analysis (i.e. people under 5 years old, etc.) | 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 |

| | |
|---|--|
| Possible methods/tools for data-collection | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -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: | 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 | |
| | Participation of neighbourhood/district level governments | No participation of neighbourhood/ | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--------------|--|--|
| | | 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: 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.

