



Food and Agriculture  
Organization of the  
United Nations



## Milan Urban Food Policy Pact Monitoring Framework

July 2018 version

**Indicator 1:** Presence of an active municipal interdepartmental government body for advisory and decision making of food policies and programmes (e.g. interdepartmental food working group, food policy office, food team)

MUFPP framework of actions' category: Governance

*The indicator allows for (self) assessment of the presence, multi-stakeholder representation and integration, functioning and effectiveness of an interdepartmental/sectoral food coordination body or mechanism. It helps identify areas for improvement.*

### Overview table

<b>MUFPP Work stream</b>	<b>Governance-</b> Ensuring an enabling environment for effective action
<b>MUFPP action</b>	<b>Facilitate collaboration across city agencies and departments</b> and seek alignment of policies and programmes that impact the food system across multiple sectors and administrative levels, adopting and mainstreaming a rights-based approach; options can include dedication of permanent city staff, review of tasks and procedures and reallocation of resources
<b>What the indicator measures</b>	The indicator allows for (self) assessment of the presence (yes or no), multi-stakeholder representation and integration, functioning and effectiveness (with use of a scoring sheet) of an interdepartmental/sectoral food coordination body or mechanism. It helps define areas for improvement.
<b>Which variables need to be measured / what data are needed</b>	Information is collected on Presence (yes/no); Multi-stakeholder Representation and Integration; Functioning and Effectiveness. Variables and criteria used for self-assessment are indicated in the scoring sheet below.
<b>Unit of measurement</b> <i>(i.e. Percentages, averages, number of people, etc.)</i>	Not applicable. This indicator will be assessed in a qualitative way.
<b>Unit(s) of Analysis</b> <i>(i.e. people under 5 years old, etc.)</i>	Not applicable. This indicator will be assessed in a qualitative way.

<b>Possible sources of information of such data</b>	-Self-assessment among representatives participating in the coordination body. Possibly validated by assessment of external actors. -Minutes/ reports of the food working group/ programme -External evaluation and study reports
<b>Possible methods/tools for data-collection</b>	-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
<b>Expertise required</b>	None for the self-assessment
<b>Resources required/ estimated costs</b>	For the self-assessment: Low to none, assessment can be implemented during a meeting of the coordination body
<b>Specific observations</b>	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 interdepartmental body (functioning, planning and delivery). Furthermore, collecting and analysis of information done collectively contributes to a capacity development process.
<b>Examples of application</b>	The city of Ede (The Netherlands) has created a dedicated municipal food team of 5 people and appointed the first food councillor in the Netherlands. The team is responsible for operationalising Ede's food strategy. In 2017, an external evaluation was asked to assess the functioning of the team and the implementation of the strategy. Applying amongst others a qualitative assessment, some of the findings of the evaluation where: -Having a well-staffed food team and corresponding budget is crucial to implementation of the food strategy. -Establishment of various partnerships with other (municipal) parties that contribute to the implementation of activities has laid an important foundation for a true integral vision and anchoring in the Ede society. -However, The "Why" of the Food vision and the integral nature of the Food programme's work are currently insufficiently visible in internal and external communication. A good communication strategy needs to be developed. - Current human and administrative support will need to be better anchored in permanent structures and budgets.

### Rationale/evidence

The Milan Urban Food Policy Pact encourages interdepartmental and cross-sector coordination internal to city governments<sup>1</sup>, working to integrate urban food policy considerations into social, economic and environment policies, programmes and initiatives, such as, inter alia, food supply and distribution, social protection, nutrition, equity, food production, education, food safety and waste reduction.

Such interdepartmental and cross-sector institutional mechanisms or bodies (food bodies, units or teams), will enhance dialogue and coordination, policy integration, impacts, and efficiency gains by 'breaking down institutional silos'. Analysis of various successful examples of such coordination mechanisms shows that key government actors include authorities that are responsible for: agriculture, health/nutrition, social protection, economic development, markets, planning, transport, and climate change<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> This call for coordination can be expanded to engagement of other levels of government (vertical integration) and non-governmental stakeholders (civil society, research organisations, private sector) in forming, implementing and assessing food policy. Note that these levels of coordination are also covered in Indicator 2: *Presence of an active multi-stakeholder food policy and planning structure (e.g. food policy councils; food partnerships; food coalitions)*.

<sup>2</sup> See the following reports: <http://www.milanurbanfoodpolicypact.org/good-practices/>;  
<http://www.ruaf.org/publications/city-region-food-systems-and-food-waste-management-2016>;  
<http://www.ruaf.org/urban-food-policies-and-programmes-overview>.

It should be noted that mere presence of an interdepartmental/sectoral coordination body (yes or no) will not provide sufficient indications on actual levels of coordination, results-impacts and gains. It will therefore be important to also assess the functioning and effectiveness of the coordination body (e.g. is it having *regular meetings*; does it have *sufficient human and financial resources* to make sure that the coordination body/mechanism functions; does the coordination mechanism actually *result* in concrete collaboration initiatives and city policies; are the functioning of the coordination body, its 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 coordination body/mechanism in the local government structures and budgets, reduces the risks of changes in city administration and shifts in allocation of budgets and is key to mainstreaming food in municipal policies. Securing the food body and programmes through legislation also makes them more resilient to government changes.

Finally, and 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.

#### [Glossary/concepts/definitions used](#)

**Presence of a municipal interdepartmental government body** for advisory and decision making of food policies and programmes: 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 line departments and sectoral programmes.

Depending on the city, interdepartmental/sectoral coordination bodies/mechanisms on urban food policies and plans, have various denominations. These vary from a *food policy office* (e.g. the Comune di Milano has recently established a Food Policy Office called "Ufficio Segretariato del MUFPP e Coordinamento Progetti Food Policy), a *municipal food unit or secretariat* (The city of Belo Horizonte, Brazil created a Municipal Secretariat for Food Policy and Supply-SMAAB with the objective to develop an integrated urban policy for food security and to coordinate all food policies and programmes towards achieving the city's overall goal: increasing the Right to Food and access to healthy food by all its citizens). The creation of the SMAAB, with a separate administrative structure and budget, mainstreamed food security into the municipal public policy), a *food team* (as in Ede, The Netherlands) or an *interdepartmental working group* on urban food issues.

**Multi-stakeholder representation and integration:** Extent to which different departments and sectors within the municipal government are a member of the coordination body/mechanism. Extent to which the body coordinates and interacts with other levels of government and non-governmental stakeholders (including CSOs, NGOs, private sector, academia etc.)

**Functioning and effectiveness of the coordination body/mechanism:** 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 in the formulation and implementation of cross-sectoral urban food policies and programmes. Criteria used here include: Is the coordinating body adequately staffed? Have partnerships been established? Are there clear mandates/terms of reference? Is it institutionalised within the local government (supported by law)? Does the coordinating body deliver on concrete collaborative initiatives, policies, and impacts? Is the coordinating body properly funded (with a clear own budget, budget for the body and its plans are included in institutional budgets of each of the members); Are there good M&E systems and regular reporting?

## 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: Preferably all representatives in the coordinating body should participate in the monitoring exercise. They should collectively fill in the scoring sheet provided below.

In addition, 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 coordinating 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 data disaggregation

During a meeting of the coordinating 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
<b>Presence of an interdepartmental/sectoral coordination body on urban food (within the municipality)</b>						
<b>Presence:</b>	<b>Yes =1 point</b>	<b>No=0 points</b>	<b>X</b> A coordination body exists but is	Total score:	Provide information on the type of coordinating body and its focus (only urban agriculture, the	

			set up and managed by non-governmental stakeholders		broader urban food system).	
<b>Multi-stakeholder representation and integration</b>						
<b>Representation:</b> Representation in the coordinating body of different departments and sectors within the city government	<b>Strong= 2 points</b> Strong: The coordination mechanism has a large representation of different sectors, including a.o. agriculture, health/nutrition, social protection.	<b>Moderate= 1 point</b> Moderate: The coordination mechanism has representation of a couple of sectors	<b>Low= 0 points</b> Low: The coordination mechanism 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	
<b>Vertical integration:</b> The interdepartmental body coordinates actions with other governments at local, national and intergovernmental levels	<b>Strong= 2 points</b> Strong coordination with one or more other levels of government (neighbourhood, province, country) or other municipal governments in the city region	<b>Moderate= 1 point</b> Moderate coordination with one or more other levels of government (neighbourhood, province, country) or other municipal governments in the city region	<b>Weak=0 points</b> Weak coordination with one or more other levels of government (neighbourhood, province, country) or other municipal governments in the city region	Total score:	-List and number of other governments engaged and forms of coordination -List governments/ levels not engaged that could be involved in future	
<b>Multi-stakeholder integration:</b> The interdepartmental body coordinates actions with other non-governmental stakeholders (civil society groups, research, private sector)	<b>Strong=2 points</b> Strong coordination with one or more other non-government stakeholders (civil society, research, private sector)	<b>Moderate= 1 point</b> Moderate coordination with one or more other non-government stakeholders	<b>Weak=0 points</b> Weak coordination with other non-government stakeholders	Total score:	-List and number of other non-governmental stakeholders engaged and forms of coordination --List of other non-governmental stakeholders not engaged that could be involved in future  <i>(Note: See further Indicator 2 on Presence of an active multi-stakeholder food policy and planning structure)</i>	

<b>Functioning and effectiveness:</b>						
<u>Criteria:</u>						
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It has a clear mandate</li> <li>2. It is institutionalised in the local government structure</li> <li>3. It has regular meetings during the year</li> <li>4. Members actively participate in meetings and decision-making and contribute to the dialogue</li> <li>5. The coordination body/mechanism has an adequate number of human resources dedicated to the functioning of the coordination mechanism</li> <li>6. It has adequate financial resources allocated to the functioning of the coordination body/system (Note that funding for implementation of an urban food strategy or programme is covered under Indicator 3).</li> <li>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 coordinating food body</li> <li>8. It engages in urban food policy/programme formulation; cross departmental/ city initiatives /policies have emerged from the coordinating food body</li> <li>9. It has power over its members to enforce recommendations and hold them accountable</li> <li>10. The functioning and activities of the coordination body are monitored, as are results and impacts of its activities to guide further planning and inform on its impacts and policy contributions.</li> </ol>						
<b>Functioning and effectiveness:</b> 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.	<b>Strong= 2 points</b> A minimum of 6-10 criteria apply	<b>Moderate = 1 point</b> A minimum of 3-6 criteria apply	<b>Low= 0 points</b> 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	
<b>Total score:</b>						

**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 an active municipal interdepartmental government 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.

In a similar way, a city may decide to give more importance to multi-stakeholder representation and integration and use a more detailed scoring system for scoring these variables: yes= the coordination body is coordinating with specific stakeholders (civil society, private sector, academia/research; specific other levels of government or other municipal governments) = 1 point per stakeholder; no coordination = 0 points.

#### Data analysis/calculation of the indicator

Based on the scoring and further (disaggregated) information provided, members of the coordinating 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 coordinating 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.