





CITY REGION FOOD SYSTEM TOOLKIT

Assessing and planning resilient and sustainable city region food systems

Guidance: Establishing terms of reference for governance platforms

| Brief description | s document sets out a process for determining monitoring | | | | |
|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|
| | mechanisms for actions, and ensuring that they are coherent with | | | | |
| | the overall outcome for the priority area. | | | | |
| Expected outcome | Stakeholders have a clear idea of the kinds of monitoring | | | | |
| | mechanisms that are suitable for actions, and they may design and | | | | |
| | revise them. | | | | |
| Expected output | Monitoring mechanisms for each action, and an extended indicator | | | | |
| | that shows coherence with outcome and main indicator. | | | | |
| Scale of application | Project level | | | | |
| Expertise required | Project management | | | | |
| Examples of application | | | | | |
| Year of development | 2022 | | | | |
| Author(s) | Jess Halliday, Joy Carey | | | | |
| Relevant CRFS Handbook | Action planning module | | | | |
| modules; related tools, | | | | | |
| examples and activities | | | | | |

Full description and justification

This document sets out a process for determining monitoring mechanisms for actions, and ensuring that they are coherent with the overall outcome for the priority area. The process involves adding two columns to the indicator framework, for the action and the monitoring mechanism. It is also recommended that stakeholders use the *Four stage process of planning and reviewing*, continually reviewing actions and progress and making revisions as necessary, as work progresses towards reaching the outcome.

This guidance is needed because it is important to design monitoring mechanisms as the actions are being designed, to ensure that progress *can* be monitored. Monitoring mechanisms that are coherent with the indicator framework ensure that actions contribute to work towards the desired outcomes.



During action planning, working group members draw up an implementation plan for each action – that is, a series of steps to enact/implement the policy or practical intervention (responsibility, timeline, resources, potential barriers, communications).

At the same time, working group members will determine how the action will be monitored, in terms of 1) its performance as it is implemented; and 2) in relation to the overall indicator for the priority area under which it falls.

To do this, it is necessary to revisit the indicator framework and insert two new columns: actions; and monitoring mechanisms for measuring progress. See table 1 below.

The monitoring mechanism relates only to the action in question and must be specific.

For example, if the action is:

Organise training courses in water harvesting techniques for women farmers, with childcare provision

The monitoring mechanisms may be:

Tracking the number of workshops organised

Tracking the number of women farmers attending

Tracking the number of women farmers attending who make use of the child-care facilities

There should be clear coherence between the data obtained through the monitoring mechanism and the main indicator that demonstrates progress towards the overall outcome for the priority area.

In the above example, if the data from the monitoring mechanism shows an increase in the number of women attending workshops, this would be expected to contribute to the overall indicator: *Number of farmers who are equipped with water harvesting techniques at the community and household level*.

However, this action may not be enough to bring about sufficient progress against the overall indicator and outcome. It may not be as effective as hoped, or other actions (concurrent or consecutive) may be required.

Alternatively, the working group members may realise that the outcome and overall indicator may need to be adjusted, to be more realistic and in line with actual experiences.

For this reason, it is helpful to keep in mind the continuously cycling 'Four stage process of planning and reviewing', as shown in Figure 1.

In the indicator framework:



- Where do we want to be relates to the outcome, which established the direction of travel, as well as the impact area/issue to be measured, which shows more specifically where stakeholders want to get to.
- How will we get there relates to the action;
- How will we know when we have got there relates to the monitoring mechanism/sub-indicator;
- Where are we now is the baseline or current data.

With each new cycle actions may be amended, or new actions introduced, as work progresses towards reaching the outcome.



Figure 1: Four stage process of planning and reviewing

Table 1: Revised indicator framework including columns for actions and monitoring mechanisms

| Priority area | Outcome (type of change) | Issue to be measured / impact area | Indicators | Actions | Monitoring mechanisms | Current data |
|---|---|---|--|---|--|-------------------|
| | Where do we want to be (direction of travel) | Where do we want to be (more specifically, where we want to get to) | How will we know when we have got there (later cycles)? | How will we get there? | How will we know when we have got there (current cycle)? | Where are we now? |
| Reduced vulnerability of CRFS to climate shocks and stresses / increased resilience | National food production sub- sector has the capacity to withstand climate shocks/stresses | The extent to which farmers are able to access new practices on water management and drought to withstand climate stresses and most likely shocks | Number of farmers who are equipped with water harvesting techniques at community and household level | Organisation of training courses in water harvesting techniques for women farmers, with childcare provision | Tracking number of workshops organised | |
| | | | | | Tracking number of women farmers attending | |
| | | | | | Tracking number of women farmers attending who make use of the child-care facilities | |



With support from



by decision of the German Bundestag 5