Ref. Ares(2024)2431697 - 03/04/2024

AfriFOODlinks

Deliverable 2.2 – City Food System Governance Assessment

Task 2.1 - Assess & evaluate existing food related governance (policies, processes, structures, capacities) and City Region Food System

Task Leader: HIVOS & ACRA;

Participants: JOOUST, UCT, FRA, INNTA, RSR

28 March 2024

Deliverable details

Title	WP	Version
City Food System Governance Assessment	**2**	**Final**

Contractual delivery date	Actual delivery date	Dissemination level
31.03.2024	**29.03.2024**	**PU**

Lead partner	Contributing partner	Reviewers
HIVOS	**ACRA**	**Amos Laar** **Andrea Calori (EStà)**

Disclaimer

This document contains confidential information in the form of the AfriFOODLinks project findings, work and products and its use is strictly regulated by the AfriFOODLinks Consortium Agreement and by Contract no. 101084322.
Neither the AfriFOODLinks Consortium nor any of its officers, employees or agents shall be responsible, liable in negligence, or otherwise how so ever in respect of any inaccuracy or omission herein.
The contents of this document are the sole responsibility of the AfriFOODLinks Consortium and can in no way be taken to reflect the views of the European Commission and the REA.

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon Europe research and innovation programme under grant agreement no. 101084322.

Contents

Deliverable details 1
Contents 2
Summary 4
AfriFOODlinks 5
WP2 - Strengthening multi-stakeholder governance processes 6
Task 2.1 7
Participants 7
Governance of Urban Food Systems 7
Methodology 8
Rapid Scan 8
Questionnaires 9
Follow up 10
Results 10
General 10
Presence of an active municipal interdepartmental government body 11
Presence of an active multi-stakeholder food policy and planning structure 13
Presence of a municipal urban food policy or strategy and/or action plans 14
Presence of an inventory of local food initiatives and practices 16
Presence of a mechanism for monitoring and inform municipal policy making 16
Governance priorities 17
Gender 18
Monitoring 19
Next Steps 19
Annexes 20
Annex 1. Questionnaire Sheet clean (EN, FR) 20
Annex 2. Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso 32
Annex 3. Kisumu, Kenya 41
Annex 4. Mbale, Uganda 50
Annex 5. Tunis, Tunisia 61
Annex 6. Cape Town, South Africa 70

Summary

AfriFOODlinks aims to address the systemic underpinnings of food insecurity and environmental impact, to lead to real transformation, delivering positive outcomes for climate and the environment, and building social and ecological resilience in 65+ Cities in Africa and Europe.

This Deliverable 2.2 is part of Work Package 2 "Strengthening multi-stakeholder governance processes" and part of Task 2.1. It describes the results of understanding the city governance situation regarding urban food. It is based on a series of meetings, a rapid scan and an extensive questionnaire. It follows the Milan Urban Food Policy Pact (MUFPP) action plan and indicator set, regarding governance. City teams used existing information and followed the methodology presented in deliverable 2.1. Based on the outcomes of these assessments, further action planning was undertaken (deliverable 2.3).

Each of the five hub cities have their own specific history and momentum, regarding food systems transformation. This is reflected in these assessments. Finalisation of this deliverable was delayed, but the process of understanding the governance, connecting to city key stakeholders, and building further adequate governance systems went on, as this is an ongoing process. In that sense these deliverables describe the current situation, and will be used as are more living documents. Further work of shared learning, also with the sharing cities, will be undertaken.

This document can be updated and improved through the contributions of the various actors involved and its use in the elaboration of work under WP2 and AfriFOODlinks in general.

Introduction

This deliverable, D 2.2, is part of three deliverables under Task 2.1: "to Assess and Evaluate Existing Food Related Governance". Based on D2.1, which sets out the methodology, the city teams embarked on further assessment of the City Food Systems Governance situation. A questionnaire, based on the MUFPP Framework for Action, related to Governance was used.

The focus and timing of this assessment was aligned as much as possible to the work and findings of other WPs, led by the city hub teams and responsible partners. In practice this was not that easy, due to different timeframes and partners.

Based on the findings and discussions related to understanding the city Governance, the city teams will further develop the city specific action plan for specific activities under AfriFOODLinks in the next 3 years. This is described in deliverable 2.3.

This deliverable, and particularly also the questionnaires per city, is meant to be a living document, under which the city teams can update the situation and as such monitor progress, as well as address lessons learned.

AfriFOODlinks

Launched in December 2022, AfriFOODlinks is an EU funded project running for four years. AfriFOODlinks aims to improve food and nutrition security while delivering positive outcomes for climate and the environment, and building socio-ecological resilience in 65+ (15 African and 5 European Hub & Sharing cities and 45+ Network Cities) cities by:

- promoting public shifts to sustainable healthy diets;
- transforming urban food environments through real-world socio-technical experiments;
- promoting inclusive multi-actor governance to empower public officials, established and informal small businesses, communities, youth and women with ownership and agency to shape their food systems; and
- accelerating innovative, women- and youth-led agri-food businesses to support local value addition and inclusive economic participation.

AfriFOODlinks works in five African "Hub Cities": Cape Town, Tunis, Kisumu, Mbale and Ouagadougou, and invites 10 African and 5 European Sharing Cities to join them on a mutual-learning journey, to share their innovative food systems work and to co-design pilot projects for implementation in each Sharing City. AfriFOODlinks is divided into 7 packages of work, which will be managed by specialists and experts in those particular fields, and will include a number of project partners.

1. Knowledge validation, amplification, creation and uptake

2. Strengthening multi-stakeholder governance processes
3. Promoting inclusive and circular agribusiness & innovation
4. Improving food environments through experimentation
5. Building lasting Africa-Europe partnerships
6. Mutual learning, exchange communications & outreach
7. Project Management

This document focuses on Work Package 2.

WP2 - Strengthening multi-stakeholder governance processes

This Work Package will work in close collaboration with WP 1, 3 and 4 (as with the other WPs) in that research, and collaboration with entrepreneurs and food environment practises will all be part of the food systems governance and actions and lessons learned under AfriFOODlinks will be shared and coordinated through various multi actor groups and platforms, facilitating food systems transformation and seeking sustainable forms of adaptive governance.
Overall WP2 aims to:

Support the development of citizen-led multi-stakeholder food governance platforms, which ensure diverse and vulnerable voices are heard to support local knowledge creation and policy development

Objectives

- To enhance vertical and horizontal governance processes in Hub Cities through strengthening existing, or developing new, Multi-stakeholder Platforms, and producing appropriate policy tools
- To celebrate local urban food systems and cultures, while informing the public and involved stakeholders, through Food Dialogues
- To ensure diverse voices are able to influence governance processes
- To build agency and improve capacity among public officials and other food system stakeholders through dedicated Food Lab processes.

AfriFOODlinks will enhance vertical and horizontal governance processes in 65+ cities by strengthening existing, or establishing new, self-sustaining Multi-Stakeholder Platforms (MSPs) in 5 Hub Cities, to hold space for cross-sector, whole-of-society dialogue and debate, with an evidence, solutions, and policy, orientation. This includes focused Food Lab Processes (FLPs) that will be convened to upskill officials and food stakeholders with specific capabilities, and to undertake policy formulation processes, contributing to the drafting of appropriate policies that address healthy diets, food safety, food environments or environmental sustainability. Furthermore, the WP will seek to develop several methodological guidelines on governance process and policy formation and co-develop policy briefs with 5 Hub and 15 Sharing Cities.
These efforts will lead to:

- Placement of sustainable healthy diets on cities' political agendas, resulting in their uptake by the public.
- Increased awareness of different types of governance as well as improved self-knowledge by local governments about their food mandate, the resources they have at their disposal, and how to improve synergies and minimise trade-offs between sectors.
- Development and uptake of food policies or strategies with clear objectives and targets.

- Empowerment of local self-functioning coalitions that are leading food systems governance.

Task 2.1

Assess & evaluate existing food related governance (policies, processes, structures, capacities) and City Region Food System
Task Leader: HIVOS & ACRA; Participants: KLIP, UCT, FRA, INNTA, RSR

In alignment with the other Work Packages, notably WP 1, but also WP 3, 4 and 5, HIVOS, ACRA and City Coordinators will undertake City food system governance assessments (D2.2) and develop City Governance Action Plans (D2.3) for each Hub City, to guide implementation of WP2.

The research undertaken under WP 1, and the assessments and proposed work as part of WP 3 and 4 will contribute to WP2 and vice versa. Based on the identified needs and governance priorities (this document) and the proposed governance action plan (D2.3) this will grow, and be strengthened in the forthcoming years.

Participants

The Task 2.1 is led by Hivos and ACRA, with the city coordinators: JOOUST in Kisumu, UCT in Cape Town, ACRA for Ouagadougou, FRA in Mbale (and Rikolto supporting the work in Ouagadougou and Mbale), Hivos with INNTA in Tunis, and the embedded researchers, coordinated by UCT and ICLEI in the Sharing Cities.

Governance of Urban Food Systems

AfriFOODlinks aims to strengthen governance and resilience of the governance processes to engage with relevant actors – including those with vested interests. A deliberate effort will be made to ensure that citizen voice and local needs are represented equitably. It further wishes to demonstrate that, contrary to many claims, there does exist a local government mandate for improving urban food security which needs to be resourced. And that this is there, and needs to be nurtured.

Given the continent's fragmented urban governance system, AfriFOODlinks will promote a coherent and participatory approach to urban governance, based around HIVOS and ACRA's experience in forging multi-actor initiatives (like Multi Stakeholder Platforms, MSPs) and RUAF's Multi-stakeholder Policy Formulation methodology. Where strong governance platforms exist, AfriFOODlinks will support this platform in identifying and prioritising food system needs and incorporating voices of those who may not be effectively represented in these platforms.

In the hub cities this is done, by mobilising existing constituencies for those affected by food insecurity inviting them into this platform as well as ensuring that platform meetings are convened in neutral spaces in different parts of the cities welcoming participants to experience different parts of the city and supporting the platform to be convened by neutral parties. In the cities where these platforms are not yet in place, the exact formation of the multi-stakeholder platforms will differ as well as the momentum cities are in. AfriFOODlinks project is wary of imposing specific platform formations, given that contextual specificities in each city will determine the most appropriate form and purpose of the platform.

The project will stimulate working with AfriFOODlinks **Core teams**, consisting of AfriFOODlinks Partners, the local authorities, and key other actors.

AfriFOODlinks articulates MSPs as spaces for engagements, and for holding tensions between different priorities and voices, encouraging open dialogue, and representing an umbrella which connects and leverages aligned activities. Based on the capacity gaps or food system priorities articulated in the MSP, or identified in other ways, Food (change) Lab Processes (FLPs) will be convened. A Food (Change) Lab is a participatory innovation process. It provides multiple stakeholders and citizens with a platform and/or safe environment, where they can prioritise issues, define their wants and needs, influence decision making, and co-create solutions to improve their city's food environment and system. In the city specific reports and in D2.3 this will be further outlined, and be undertaken in the cities, under D2.8. For more on Governance see the D2.1. and its references.

Methodology

Based on the suggested and guiding methodology and tool, provided in D2.1, and in alignment with similar information gathering under WP 1, 3 and 4 assessments, the city teams identified and met with key stakeholders, and gathered information.

In the Consortium meeting in Kisumu (19-23 June 2023), first results of the Rapid Scans by WPs 1-4, and further use of methodologies and the sharing of results was discussed.

After that, several joint WP 2 team meetings and bilateral meetings with the City Teams have been held to discuss the use of the tools and findings.

Rapid Scan

A Rapid Scan was done through an assisted self-assessment of the cities, using secondary data collected by the city teams in collaboration with representatives, focusing on:
• Key government departments related to the food system, and their responsibilities;
• Level of collaboration with other ministries or local authorities (provinces, regions …)
• The availability of urban food system assessments, stakeholder mapping, and policy analysis (related to aspects of the food system (local, regional, national);
• Food policies and programmes at a city or national level;
• Management processes that govern exchanges within food supply and commodity value chains;
• Formal governance and decision-making processes;
• Existence of multi-stakeholder platforms and other networks for interaction.
• Presence of local initiatives and civil society food movements

In the bilateral meetings we discussed more specific follow-up questions to the cities to have more information on interpretation of available information, governance, etc.

The extent and quality of information was different, as not every city was in the same momentum and maturity of institutional development. Also, the background, history, and size of the cities influence this, as does external funding (donors, projects, etc.). However, this information enabled us to understand, in our interactions with the cities, how to draft the MSP and what kind of topics they should deal with.

The Rapid Scan results and discussion with the teams, also led to the decision to develop an extensive questionnaire to guide further information gathering and analysis of the city urban food system governance.

Questionnaires

The format of the Questionnaires is given in Annex 1a (English) and 1b (French). This format is based on the MUFPP (Milan Urban Food Policy Pact) Action Plan, and Monitoring Framework, while also seeking to identify key governance issues for further focus.

The format starts with an overview of what information has been received, and then each section, following the MUFPP Action Points, is also introduced with general information gathered from the Rapid Scan discussions, or other literature. Also, the joint and bilateral meetings discussed this: what information was available (with links) and whether it was complete. The WP2 team also referred back to the suggested methodology and tools in D2.1.

The sections of the Questionnaires are:

A) Further Detailed Overview following MUFPP Governance Action Points

Following specific questions regarding the five points:
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)
2: Presence of an active multi-stakeholder food policy and planning structure (e.g. food policy councils; food partnerships; food coalitions)
3: Presence of a municipal urban food policy or strategy and/or action plans
4: Presence of an inventory of local food initiatives and practices to guide development and expansion of municipal urban food policy and programmes
5: Presence of a mechanism for assembling and analysing urban food system data to monitor/evaluate and inform municipal policy making on urban food policies

Questions also addressed city team opinions on functioning, presence of key actors, etc.

B) Stakeholder Mapping
Whether a stakeholder mapping had been done, or would require an update. If not to do so, using the Tool Stakeholder Mapping (D2.2 Optional Tool Stakeholder Mapping)
Also referring back to Food Policy Mapping done under other WPs (notably 3 and 4). A format for presenting these policies was also provided (D2.2 Food Policy Action Canvas MUFPP tool).

C) main Multi Actor Platform(s)
To provide arguments for the selection of several and a main Multi Stakeholder Platform (for Deliverable 2.3, including suggesting verification meetings with the MSP or Core team of your city).
To provide information on the main platform to align the AfriFOODLinks project to, what planning of meeting, info on the main lead/core team members of this platform; meeting sequence, and (if available), what the main agenda is.

D) Municipality Priorities and Governance Research Issues
To start discussing the issues on Governance seen as important for further research for AfriFOODLinks by the city teams, some key issues were asked.

Follow up

The time it took to get organised, and to fill in these questionnaires differed considerably between the cities. This was partly also because the WP1 research scan took more time in most cities (which also contained a section on governance), while at the same time the other WPs also worked with the same city teams in gathering information for their activities. Several follow up meetings were undertaken, and the deliverable was delayed.

With ICLEI, it was also acknowledged that the AfriFOODLinks Gender Framework and the specific Action Plan for WP2 in this, was brought to the table, but not yet fully applied in the Governance analysis. This is because the MUFPP Framework does not contain specific questions (except for disaggregation of data). The city teams in their assessments focused on institutions and their collaboration, and not yet going in detail in the assessment of the functioning of these platforms and institutions, regarding gender and inclusiveness. This will most definitely be followed up in further work and meetings of WP2.

It is suggested to discuss in D2.3 and beyond on how to update the stakeholder analysis, in combination with capacity (and capacity support needs) assessment and gender assessment.

Results

General

Most teams used the questionnaires to organise available information. Not always information from earlier projects were used (although the city teams did refer to this), while the filled-in questionnaires were not always discussed with various other actors, active in relation to food systems transformation in the city.

The extent and quality of information was different, as each city is in a different process of attention for and working with food systems transformation. However, this information enabled us to understand, in our discussions with the cities, how to pursue on D2.3 (Governance Action Plans), to agree on the main priorities and focus areas. In that sense the MUFPP Framework is a useful tool. It proves also to be useful in further tracking change, but for each city specific use of the Indicator Framework will have to be undertaken. Likewise, working with these assessments, also supports local and inter-city interaction, and as such contributing to enhanced awareness. Hence, the tools and canvas suggested, will be used and adapted in the further process.

The City Teams did not embark on using the tools as suggested, to analyse the functioning of the institutions and platforms, hence the assessment at this point remains descriptive. On the other hand, despite the delay in deliverables, and lack of thorough research, the process of interacting with the main stakeholders, strategizing on how to further work on Governance under AfriFOODLinks, building the alignments, and planning with key stakeholders was facilitated (and further developed under D2.3).

In the next sections an overview of the main findings per city, under the five MUFPP indicators, and regarding priorities for further research on Governance and Monitoring are given.

Overview Table.

	1. Municipal interdepartmental body	2. Multi stakeholder platform(s)	3. Food policy	4. Inventory of local food initiatives	5. Food policy analysis
Cape Town	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Kisumu	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Mbale	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Ouagadougou	No	No	No	No	No
Tunis	No	No	Yes	No	Yes

Presence of an active municipal interdepartmental government body

Urban Food Systems involve a wide variety of actors, at various levels and from different sectors. Cities dedicated to developing more sustainable and resilient urban food systems, actively facilitate collaboration across city agencies and departments. This would include sharing information, joint planning and budgeting, as well as joint planning, alignment of policies and programmes that impact the urban food system. It can also include mainstreaming joint vision and agreed approaches.

All the five cities do have a designated body or department that coordinates or leads food systems work. This has not always been a clear choice, but happened because of a donor drive activity/project, because of a personal drive, timing of developing an action plan, etc. Hence it is important to further analyse in the process, what mandates, strengths and weaknesses, opportunities for further collaboration (both vertically or horizontally) and to enhance collaboration and effectiveness.

In **Cape Town**, under the City Resilience Strategy, the Food Systems Programme was agreed in 2021. A **Food System Working Group** (FSWG), resides within **the Risk and Resilience Department of the Municipality** that acts as coordinating body. However, as it does coordinate city departments, and also with the main provincial department, and plays an active role in enhancing food systems governance, several linkages are not yet well established (to higher governance at other provincial and national level), while several other informal bodies exist, including a Food Systems Community Practice for food researchers and academics. There is also no direct budget for this work. There is a core group of actors, though, that regularly meet with the FSWG. A stakeholder mapping was done in 2014 and is regularly updated. This group includes a wide variety of governmental and non-governmental actors. An annual Food Systems Report is prepared. Sectors not engaged are private sector actors, as well as various national government departments. This is part of ongoing efforts of the City, and will be supported by AfriFOODlinks.

Before 2010 the **Kisumu** municipality was a separate unit. After the new Kenyan Constitution in 2010, Kisumu city now is part (sub-counties) of Kisumu **county**. The county is broader than the city, and falls under the National Government; the city functions as a department. Hence, there is no specific department at the city level that coordinates Urban Food. The Kisumu County Government Department of Agriculture functions as the main actor. However, Kisumu County has its Food-System-

Strategy-2023-2027 (see below). There is no specific budget for implementation of the strategy, but different government departments with relevant mandates contribute to strategy implementation. The departments (Agriculture, Fisheries, Livestock, Trade, Public health, nutrition, etc) have annual work plans and budgets that contribute to the strategy. The County Agricultural Sector Steering Committee (CASSCOM), is biased towards production, and has little focus on other actors in the urban food system.

The city of **Tunis**, builds further on the FAO supported draft Governance model (developed and discussed in 2021). Currently, Food Policy Planning is done at national level by the National food security council and the National Commission for sustainable development. The municipality of Tunis draws on all existing regulatory texts in Tunisia, including the constitution, the commitment to social justice, sustainable development, and the rational exploitation of natural resources. The municipalities are given an important, but yet to develop role, in the food governance systems of Tunis. **The municipality of Tunis** positions itself as the keystone of the system to build a vision, establish partnerships and lasting relationships with liaison groups and advisory groups on food systems, which promotes collaboration between public sector and sector private and facilitates coordination between different policy areas and levels of governance. In 2022, the Municipality of Tunis published the report on "Modèle de gouvernance alimentaire urbain pour la commune de Tunis: Vers un modèle de gouvernance alimentaire efficace et durable". This model proposes the establishment of a (food safety) unit, attached to the Municipality of Tunis and composed of a multidisciplinary team, responsible for technical and administrative aspects. The proposed "**Municipal Food Security Unit**" is not yet operational.

In **Mbale**, the Mbale City Council (MCC) is in charge of food policy formulation and implementation in the city, serving as the legislative body responsible for enacting laws, regulations, and policies that directly impact on the City's urban food system. Through its legislative powers, the City Council shapes the local legal framework, allocates resources for the well-being and progress of its constituents. Additionally, the Council serves as a coordinator between the community and municipal administration, facilitating public participation, voicing citizens' concerns, and contributing to the overall social and economic development of the city. Specifically, the staff in charge is the Head of Production who sits at the Council. The under the Rikolto project supported **Good Food Council** – GFC: is a technical committee providing leadership in the implementation of the program interventions in Mbale City. This will be used as a vehicle in supporting Mbale City Council.

In **Ouagadougou**, currently there is no such structure in the municipality, but there are two institutions that deal with relevant policies: the Foresight, Planning and Studies Department (DPPE) of the Town Hall, which mainly supports production activities supported by the municipality in the city's "green belt", a green area of Ouagadougou where since 2018 the municipality and civil society associations are trying to expand and improve a variety of urban gardens spontaneously started by the citizens on the land ; and the Town Hall hygiene department, which mainly monitors the hygiene conditions of the city's restaurants. Practical activities on the terrain are mainly set up by NGOs and civil society actors who are coordinated with the institutions involved in this project. At the level of the central region (region housing the Municipality of Ouagadougou), the governorate has within it a consultation framework on food security in the region and the members of this framework meet every six months to discuss food security in the region. At the national level, there is the Ministry of Agriculture for monitoring the achievement of food security; the ministry in charge of research through the placement of new varieties and seeds from the perspective of food safety; the Ministère de l'Environnement; the minister of urbanism through the occupation of spaces; the Ministry of Health for questions of nutrition and the Ministry of Economy and Finance for questions of financing and creation of growth poles. There are other actors associated occasionally or informally in certain activities, such as the federation of market gardeners and nursery growers, customary authorities, the Provincial Directorate of Agriculture, the regional chamber of agriculture, the provincial directorate of

water and forests. Finally, the "Decree No. 2003-670/PRES/PM/MAECR/MFB/MEDEV adopting the general framework for State-partner cooperation in matters of food security" established this formal body bringing together several state and non-state actors which generally meets in the event of a food emergency.

Presence of an active multi-stakeholder food policy and planning structure

The term Multi-stakeholder platform is broadly defined as an approach of building synergies and partnerships with key actors, such as civil society organisations, governments, private sector, and the community, all groups who are crucial to engage in addressing food system problems. Multi-stakeholder platforms (MSPs) are a potential way to address some of the challenges of effectively supporting cities to transition narratives around food to a more food systems-based framing. They have the potential to contribute to food systems governance by facilitating linkages between actors and scales, and support the development of long-term relationships with partners in knowledge exchange, sharing risks and benefits, human and financial capital, and innovative ideas. Various forms of Multi Stakeholder Platforms (MSPs) on Urban Food systems are possible, at various levels, and with various purposes. Often, they are project (external donors) supported and dependent. Different platforms may exist at various levels, including Food Labs. The inventory sought to identify the most important and active MSPs and select with the City Teams the platforms AfriFOODLinks would seek to work with. In the more advanced cities there are various platforms at different levels, with overlapping actors. All cities to further develop these different platforms and seek to further align and make them more inclusive.

In **Cape Town**, Cape Town is home to an advanced coalition of multi-stakeholder platforms working on food.
Existing MSPs include the City of Cape Town Food Systems Working Group (CTFSWG); the Western Cape Economic Development Partnership (WCEDP) Food Forum; the Centre of Excellence in Food Security Food Imbizo; the Cape Town Food Dialogues; and the Food Agency Cape Town food dialogues.
There is a core group of 30 actors, that includes City and provincial officials, key NGOs and CSO and academics. Various meetings are organised in which different actors participate. The City Food System Working Group meets on an ad hoc basis, and invites other actors. The Food Systems Research Community Practice is convened bi-annually to align and co-ordinate research projects; Food Dialogues are organised, with a wide public, Food Imbizo, and Food Indaba, for selected audiences. As mentioned above, actors not yet involved, such as SAWITA representing informal traders and others, are invited in quarterly informal trader meetings. SAWITA and others will be invited in selected meetings (see further under D2.3).

In **Kisumu**, the Food Liaison Advisory Group (FLAG) is a multi-stakeholder governance mechanism, at county level, to promote dialogue and propose recommendations to local governments on priority actions to be implemented in urban areas. FLAG is currently not instituted by law, plans are underway to institute it. FLAG is convened by the department of agriculture, and is rather technical. There is a need for a Multi stakeholder forum specific to the city, with city stakeholders, including actors at all stages of the urban food system.
Other platforms are Kisumu County Agricultural Sector Steering Committee (KCASSCOM) and the Kisumu Local Interaction Platform (KLIP), both not very active due to lack of funding.

In **Tunis**, there is no formal MSP as of yet, but there are National Council and Commissions and Working Groups responsible for decision-making in relation of the formulation and/or implementation of food policies and programs. For example: le Conseil National de Protection du Consommateur; le Conseil National de la Sécurité Alimentaire; and, Groupes de Travail sur l'élaboration de stratégie dont l'alimentation est un axe principal. Example: Comité multisectoriel de la stratégie nationale de prévention et de lutte contre l'obésité et de la stratégie nationale de prévention et de contrôle des maladies non transmissibles.
Supported by FAO, the Municipality of Tunis has been working on its urban food system transformation since 2019. This was a participatory process, involving many other actors, including UN Habitat, INNTA, and several municipal and national technical Government Departments. Several meetings have also been held as part of the UN Food Systems Summit Dialogues. This has resulted in a draft Urban Food Strategy.

In **Mbale**, there are three main platforms present:
1) The Good Food Council – GFC: under the Rikolto funded project, which is a technical committee providing leadership in the implementation of the program interventions in Mbale City.
2) The Good Food Parliament – GFP: which serves as a Multi Stakeholder Platform with the objective of promoting and ensuring access to healthy, sustainable and equitable food systems within urban areas; facilitating collaboration and coordination among Food Systems Actors; fostering regular multi-stakeholder discussions.
3) The Mbale City Food Systems Platform (MCFSP) under Makerere University brings together all relevant players and stakeholders to prioritise Mbale's foodshed.
AfriFOODLinks will prioritise working with GFP and GFC, since Mbale City utilises these two multi-actor platforms, the Good Food Parliament (GFP) and the Mbale City Food Systems Platform (MCFSP), as dialogue tools for advocating supportive policies and practices more so as knowledge sharing platforms.

In **Ouagadougou**, Currently, there is no multi-actor platform that tracks food policies as a whole. Practical activities on the ground are mainly implemented by NGOs and civil society actors who coordinate with local institutions according to each project. The system most similar to such a platform is the coordination that tracks Green Belt activities of the city from 2018. This is a non-formalized mechanism, but which has been operating for several years and certain elements of which can be taken up and applied to other areas of the food supply chain. This platform does not have regularly scheduled meetings or an activity reporting system indicated in the statutes, but is organised on the basis of the needs of the activities implemented in the green belt. These structures are managed by institutional actors as well as civil society, including
Foresight, Planning and Studies Department (DPPE) of the Town Hall, ACRA, Rikolto, Mani Tese, and the Federation of market gardeners and nurserymen. Private enterprises also play an important role in the management of the territory. The objective of this committee is to manage the green belt of Ouagadougou in a participatory manner by organising monitoring and support for the activities of existing producers through the creation of a series of regular meetings between the relevant stakeholders. The objective is for the Municipality to be able to organise rules and take charge of the management of the area. This type of platform was a positive experience for the development and monitoring of the green belt. As part of AfriFOODlinks project, the NGO Rikolto is supporting an exchange platform, which will form the basis for enhancing the MSP and met for the first time in December 2023.

Presence of a municipal urban food policy or strategy and/or action plans

A typical urban Food Strategy sets out a unifying vision for a city's food system and contains commitments to creating the conditions in which a healthy, just and sustainable food system can flourish. It contains key strategies for action and suggested pathways and actors to pursue these. Securing high-level political buy-in to the food strategy process is crucial, while at the same time ensuring decentralised ownership of the strategy, to enhance sustainability and prevent dependency on any political changes along the road. An urban food strategy may also contain commitments from the many actors or stakeholders who are involved in its development, ideally through a participatory approach, as well as ways of keeping track of its change.

The main focus of city (region) or higher-level strategies does not always have to be food or food system transformation. It can be broader, or linked to other topics (climate, health, nutrition, etc.). Key is to use these, clarify food focus and leverage on opportunities.

Cape Town, launched the City's Resilience Strategy. This strategy identified food security as a key focus point for the city. This, together with the COVID-19 and 2018 water crises, led to the establishment of the Food Systems Programme (FSP) in 2021. The Resilience Strategy represents an important starting point for the City's food work. It is applied and is a living strategy so constantly updated and acted on as new possibilities, research and funding emerge. The Food Systems Working group have had impact by enabling food systems mainstreaming into City Policy, including inputs to the Urban Agriculture Policy, Informal Sector Support Framework, District Spatial Plans, Metropolitan Spatial Development Framework, Comprehensive Integrated Transport Plan, Informal Trading Norms and Standards and recently the Integrated Development Plan, ensuring a five-year commitment. Cape Town has already started integrating food into spatial planning and design processes.

The **Kisumu**, County-Food-System-Strategy-2023-2027 is a product of FLAG, and was donor driven. It is geared towards supporting the food system by strengthening the Food system governance: Production, Post-harvest handling and value addition, Infrastructure development; Market access and ICT; Nutrition, food safety and health and mainstreaming Cross Cutting issues. The Strategy is not yet implemented, but it is a major vehicle for AfriFOODLinks and the Municipality to further implementation.

Tunis City has no Food Strategy, but supported by FAO, the Municipality of Tunis has been working on its urban food system transformation since 2019. This was a participatory process, involving many other actors, including UN Habitat, INNTA, and several municipal and national technical Government Departments. Several meetings have also been held as part of the UN Food Systems Summit Dialogues. This has resulted in a draft Urban Food Strategy, including attention to Governance.

The city of **Mbale**, has no Food Strategy. This implies that the City lacks coordinated efforts to address issues such as food production, distribution, nutrition, and food safety within Mbale City. However, the AfriFOODlinks in collaboration with the City leadership and other partners and stakeholders are in the process of developing a framework to guide urban food systems related interventions in Mbale.
In addition, AfriFOODlinks will collaborate with, and seek to support the District, City and Sub county/Divisions' Nutrition Coordination Committees on their role and mandate in planning, budgeting, coordination and supervision of the food systems, nutrition and food safety interventions as well as addressing the food systems concerns across the Mbale District and Mbale City.

In **Ouagadougou**, there is no Food Strategy yet. A start is made with a reference document with key actions and actors at the municipal level.

Presence of an inventory of local food initiatives and practices

Based on earlier or ongoing external funded programmes, or governmental regular planned activities, local initiatives on different aspects of the food systems, and its various food value chains may be identified, registered, monitored and/or supported. This information can be regularly updated, and shared.

In **Cape Town**, in many neighbourhoods, self-organised Community Action Networks were established to help citizens in need. Nevertheless, the City compiled a list of civil society and community-based organisations they could support, and collaborated with the provincial government and civil society to provide food relief through community kitchens and food parcels. To identify vulnerable households, the administration repurposed a vulnerability map created during the 2017-2018 water crisis. The Philippi Horticultural Area, an agricultural zone that has a fresh produce market, was revitalised and augmented with an agri-hub through the City's Urban Catalytic Investment project, using the space as a hub for food distribution and refrigeration facilities.

A City Action Summary Document is updated on an ongoing process and forms the basis for the annual Food Systems Report. It requires collaboration across multiple departments. This is also a key document that enables action in times of risk as vulnerable areas are targeted through the inventory or partners.
Various different events specific to different sectors, such as the informal economy, but also health engagements. The food programme group actively aligns with and where possible supports these events. [Primarily through the Food Dialogues.]

In **Kisumu**, the FAO supported development of the Flag in collaboration with Kisumu County, and has an informal inventory of ongoing initiatives. Furthermore, several projects, including the EU funded HealthyFoodAfrica Programme also have undertaken an inventory. These various inventories will be brought together and analysed as a next step under AfriFOODLinks. Particularly also Market Trader Associations need to be involved.

In **Tunis**, there are studies undertaken by FAO, in support of the Municipality. However, there is no recent inventory. This will be part of the assignment of Nomade and OSAE as two key partners working with Hivos, INNTA and the Municipality of Tunis in enhancing its Governance.

In **Mbale**, under the Rikolto project a beginning is made with these inventories and analyses.

In **Ouagadougou**, there is no inventory of local food initiatives. However, the city has a directory of structures which invest in the green belt as part of the redevelopment project that the Town Hall has started since 2018. A recent stakeholder mapping will be worked out, and includes partners as Rikolto, ACRA, Mani Tese, AFPPME, ADEU, IRSAT, INADES formation, Consumer League, La Saisonnière, Beonere , Sena bio, Federation of market gardeners.

Presence of a mechanism for monitoring and inform municipal policy making

A multi sectoral and multi-level information system for policy development and accountability can be established, which enhances the availability, quality, quantity, coverage and management and exchange of data related to urban food systems (change). This can be a simple system, actively managed, using specific dashboards for communication, and regularly be on the agenda of various MSPs. It can include both formal data collection and data generated by urban actors. The MUFPP has developed an Indicator Framework that can be of use to the cities.

In **Cape Town**, this is embedded within wide city data gathering and engagement processes. An annual Food Systems report reports progress and trends. It informs the Implementation Programme. Ad hoc processes are initiated as needed in response to a particular crisis to determine risk and intervention. The various meetings that are organised do not always have notes. Those that do make notes, not always actively share these. Internal (WG) meeting processes are not made public. However, regular meetings are held every two months. Reports are distributed to WG members but not advertised publicly.

In **Kisumu**, several publications exist on the urban food system and related policies. However, there is no mechanism for monitoring and municipal policy making as of yet. Earlier studies have shown that: the urban food system is largely informal, posing challenges in governance; Government agencies have inadequate capacity to ensure food safety; and cartels control food trade in the major municipal markets.

In **Tunis**, there is no such mechanism yet. However, as a member of MUFPP, there is the option of following the suggested Indicator Framework.

In **Mbale**, the GFC and GCP, regularly meet. Minutes and reports are available and accessible from the office of the City Council. These are submitted by Partners after implementation of every activity. The GFP and GFC aim to assess the impact, effectiveness, and outcomes of any existing related urban food policies, identifying areas for improvement, and providing evidence-based insights that inform the development and refinement of future policies. Regularly measuring and analysing the key performance indicators, tracking milestones and conducting periodic reviews to ensure alignment with policy objectives, are undertaken currently under the Rikolto project. Tracking key indicators including changes in food security, nutrition, and sustainability, analysing data collected through surveys, stakeholder feedback, and performance metrics, and utilising this information to inform policy adjustments, improvements, and evidence-based decision-making.

In **Ouagadougou**, there is no such mechanism yet. However, several initiatives are underway to guide the action of supply chain actors, including:
• The FoodTERRE festival
• The month of eating local
• The agroecology festival
These events provide spaces for discussion and awareness raising for most of the actors in the food chain in Ouagadougou and the municipality is always involved in these initiatives. Also, as a member of MUFPP, there is the option of following the suggested Indicator Framework.

Governance priorities

Based on the information gathered, and the various meetings and other interactions with key stakeholders, the city teams developed a list of priorities with regards to Governance action. The resulting lists did not always focus on Governance, but indirectly all touched on important and related issues.

In **Cape Town**,
-Alignment to Provincial and National Policy Frameworks and platforms;
-Reaching out to those actors not yet involved in the various platforms and meetings. This relates to the private sector (informal sector and formal larger businesses), and consumers;
-More actively disseminating information to the wide public, and finding forms of involving the wide public in urban food systems change;

In **Kisumu**,
-Alignment of the County to the City, as part of vertical governance. This will require several meetings, while seeking to understand the mandate, power, and opportunities of each of these level actors.;
-At County level, horizontal alignment, and focusing on non-technical issues;
-Reaching out to those actors not yet involved in the various platforms and meetings;

In **Tunis**,
-Supporting the Municipality of Tunis in setting up an active unit on Urban Food Systems, supported by a multi-actor core team;
-Developing various MSPs, and supporting its sustainability. Including regular meetings of MSP on Urban Food;
-Develop and implement comprehensive city-level by-laws;
-Reaching out to those actors not yet involved in the various platforms and meetings.

In **Mbale**,
-Building together with the Rikolto Good Food Programme, as a sustainable Food Council and Food Parliament;
-Mobilise, organise, and actively engage local leadership;
-Informality (food markets, vendors, safety and hygiene;
-Establishment of an incubation project and a Food Court in Mbale City;

In **Ouagadougou**,
-Governance and Coordination;
-Regulations and Enforcement;
-Local food productions support;
-Food Safety and Value Chain infrastructure;
-Food Loss and Waste;
-Finance.

Gender

AFriFOODlinks recognizes the importance of gender equality in promoting food security and enhancing the livelihoods of smallholder farmers and communities at large. The project's human and gender rights action plan outlines strategies that will be employed to ensure that gender is prioritised in all project activities. Thus, the AfriFOODlinks project seeks to leverage and harness opportunities within the broader project implementation objectives, to push for gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls across cities in Africa and Europe.

AfriFOODlinks adopts a holistic and adaptive gendered lens in all its structures and activities, particularly in spaces for decision-making. This adaptive lens engenders context specific application (flexibility, intersectionality, and participatory).

Under WP 2 it is therefore agreed to integrate Gender in all levels of our work, including Governance assessments.
Several considerations for the development of the gender mainstreaming in the project include:
• Ensuring gender balance and opportunities for contribution of women to be amplified in meetings and events;
• Engaging city departments in charge of social development or gender equality and women's rights organisations to participate in multi-stakeholder discussions;
• Innovative, context specific gender lens training targeted at city department officials that interact in the food system;
• Establishing safe spaces for youth and women to express themselves during workshops, dialogues and decision-making;
• Involving women in decision-making and carefully assessing potential additional strain and impacts of new innovation on women and girls;
• Encouraging positive masculinities throughout interactions;
• Building the capacity of staff to identify and address gender biases and stereotypes in their area of responsibility.

In the current assessment, the city teams predominantly looked at institutional presence in the MSPs and at the presence of platforms. In the next 3 years ambitious goals will be set with the selected MSPs, which will be supported and monitored.

Monitoring

The Milan Urban Food Policy Pact (MUFPP) Monitoring Framework Handbook and Resource Pack, developed by RUAF and FAO with the MUFPP Secretariat, offers a set of tools and resources that help cities to develop a way of measuring progress of their own priorities against clear baselines. In this assessment the MUFFP main indicators have been discussed, and will be used as a general framework. Aligning to other forms of measuring change, WP 2 under AfriFOODLinks will support the cities in using the Framework, and help to deepen understanding of the recommended actions of the MUFPP and increase stakeholder engagement and awareness. The more cities not only implement, but also measure, the impacts of their urban food policies, the greater will be their collective learning of how to successfully and positively transform urban food systems.

Next Steps

Based on the findings and discussions as described here, the city teams will further develop the city specific action plan for specific activities under AfriFOODLinks in the next 3 years. This is described in deliverable 2.3. At the same time, monitoring of the work under WP 2 will be developed and agreed. And based on an updated stakeholder assessment, that includes capacity assessments, capacity building needs assessment and action planning (including on gender and inclusivity), the governance action plans will be operationalised.

Annexes

Annex 1. Questionnaire Sheet clean (EN, FR)

AfriFOODLinks
WP2 D2.2 City Governance Assessment, detailed Questions and formats
Name CITY

A Rapid Scan was done through an assisted self-assessment of the cities, following the 5 key points listed in the methodology and taken up by 5 of the MUFPP Framework for Action, which are:

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)
2: Presence of an active multi-stakeholder food policy and planning structure (e.g. food policy councils; food partnerships; food coalitions)
3: Presence of a municipal urban food policy or strategy and/or action plans
4: Presence of an inventory of local food initiatives and practices to guide development and expansion of municipal urban food policy and programmes
5: Presence of a mechanism for assembling and analysing urban food system data to monitor/evaluate and inform municipal policy making on urban food policies.
6. Existence of a food supply emergency/food resilience management plan for the municipality (in response to disasters; vulnerabilities in food production, transport, access; socio economic shocks, etc.) based on vulnerability assessment (See: https://www.fao.org/in-action/food-for-cities-programme/news/detail/ru/c/1472942/)

You can find more on these action points at:
https://www.milanurbanfoodpolicypact.org/framework-for-action/
Or in the attachment: *D2.2 MUFPP actions tool.*

For the numbering (A-D) below, we also refer to the mail sent to you:

A) Further Detailed Overview following MUFPP Governance Action Points
Check the draft city surface scan summary of your city (see below, and the added text per point: 1-5).
This follows the MUFPP 5 key points of action on Governance.

Please *Correct* mistakes, *Add information and links* of key documents, in answering these questions.
Then please, seek to reply the questions raised, in the tables.

We can also discuss and finalise together in a short meeting proposed for the week of 6 November.

The overview of the Rapid Scan shows:

	1. Municipal interdepartmental body	2. Multi stakeholder platform	3. Food policy	4. Inventory of local food initiatives	5. Food policy analysis
Cape Town	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Kisumu	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO
Mbale	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO
Ouagadougou	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Tunis	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES

It is important to consider that in all cases, even if the answer in the table is marked as "NO", there are already some seminal policy in place, hence the project is never moving from a total lack of previous initiatives. All the cities had some sort of food policy and what might be missing is a formal framework coordinating actors and initiatives. It is also worth adding that from this scan we noticed what is missing according to our framework, but we could not get what are the priorities according to the different municipalities, which could be an important information to better coordinate the next steps of the project. There is other information that might be helpful to further develop this analysis and using the tools developed by MUFPP for the monitoring might be an effective strategy to get them. Indeed, using those tools at this stage can make the project staff and the other actors familiar with the framework and categories that MUFPP proposed for the monitoring.

Questionnaire:

1: Presence of an active municipal interdepartmental government body for advisory and decision making of food policies and programmes

For your City….give summary.
Provide info, found in other documents (WP2 team and City team).

Then: Please fill the following form about the Coordinating Body or Interdepartmental Government Body.
If this information is available in a document or website, please send or provide the link.
If your city does not have it, please indicate what potential actors might be involved on it.

a) Representation in the coordinating body of different departments and sectors within the city government (horizontal integration)	
List and number of different sectors or actors? participating and their roles	
List sectors not engaged that could be involved in future	
b) The coordinating body integrates other level governments at local, national and intergovernmental levels (vertical integration)	
List and number of other levels of governments participating and their roles	
List governments/ levels not engaged that could be involved in future	
c) The interdepartmental body coordinates actions with other governments at local, national and intergovernmental level (what is the difference with b?)	
List and number of other levels of governments engaged and forms of coordination	

List governments/ levels not engaged that could be involved in future	
d) The interdepartmental body coordinates actions with other non-governmental stakeholders (civil society groups, research, private sector)	
List and number of other non-governmental stakeholders engaged and forms of coordination	
List and number of other non-governmental stakeholders not engaged that could be engaged in future	
e) 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	
Mandate/ Terms of Reference	
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	

2. Presence of an active multi-stakeholder food policy and planning structure

For your City….give summary.
Provide info, found in other documents (WP2 team and City team).

Then:
Please fill the following form about the multi-stakeholder structure.
-If your city has different platforms, please fill this form in for each platform. And Indicate which platform you suggest AfriFOODLinks should focus on.
-If your city does not have it, please indicate what potential actors should be involved in it.

a) Representation in the multi-stakeholder body of different departments and sectors within the city government	
List and number of different sectors participating and their roles (also see the list in the Tool Stakeholder Mapping)	
List sectors not engaged that could be involved in future	

b) The multi-stakeholder body integrates other levels governments at local, national and intergovernmental levels (vertical integration)	
List and number of other levels of governments participating and their roles	
List governments/ levels not engaged that could be involved in future	
c) The multi-stakeholder body counts with participation of other non-governmental stakeholders (civil society groups, research, private sector) and representation of vulnerable groups	
List and number of non-governmental stakeholders	
List and number of specific vulnerable groups (youth, women, migrants, low-income category consumers/producers)	
d) The multi-stakeholder 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	
Mandate/ Terms of Reference	
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	

3. Presence of a municipal urban food policy framework or strategy (or action plans).

For your City….give summary.
Provide info, found in other documents (WP2 team and City team).

Then:
Please fill the following form about available urban food policy framework or strategy.
If your city is only partially applying it or it is in the process of planning it, you can fill the relevant section; if your city does not have it and it is not in the process of planning it, you can present the most relevant documents existing on this sector and use this question to analyse them.

Please also do indicate the link of actions to AfriFOODLinks Programme
List of Strategies, policy frameworks.

NAME Food Policy Framework or Strategy	
Is the urban food policy fully or partially applied?	

There is a specific budget for the urban food policy? If yes, what is the institution/department funding it?	
Is the urban food policy publicly accessible? If yes, where (published on paper, on internet, etc)?	
How was the urban food policy designed (procedures, actors involved, etc.)?	
What are the main objectives stated?	
What policy measures/instruments are effectively applied?	
What measuring targets and tools have been set?	
Does the policy/strategy/action plan define which organisation will lead and coordinate the framework to facilitate its implementation and operational planning?	
Have sources of financing been clearly identified and assigned, and a timeframe defined to implement, coordinate and monitor the policy/strategy/action plan?	

4. Presence of an inventory of local food initiatives and practices to guide development and expansion of municipal urban food policy and programmes

For your City….give summary.

Please fill the following form about the inventory of local food initiatives. if your city does not have it and it is not in the process of planning it, you can present the most relevant documents existing on this sector and use this question to analyse them.

Is the inventory used to guide development and expansion of municipal urban food policy and programmes?	
A specific budget for developing and up-dating the inventory is made available by the city to local NGOs/research institutes?	
The inventory is publicly accessible for use by any governmental or nongovernmental stakeholder?	

What other - formal and informal - forms of Governance related to Urban food or Urban food environment could you mention, which are not present in the above, like festivals, saving and loan groups, market associations, etc. …

5. Presence of a mechanism for assembling and analysing urban food system data to monitor/evaluate and inform municipal policy making on urban food policies

For your City….give summary.

Please fill the following form about the mechanism for assembling and analysing urban food system data. if your city does not have it and it is not in the process of planning it, you can present the most relevant documents existing on this sector and use this question to analyse them.

The monitoring/evaluation mechanism monitors is used to support the formulation of urban food policies? If yes how?	
The monitoring/evaluation mechanism monitors is used to assess the food policy implementation progress? If yes how?	
The monitoring/evaluation mechanism monitors is used to assess the impacts of the urban food policies? If yes how?	
Are the data collected in a disaggregated way? If yes how?	
Are the data shared with the other stakeholders? If yes with whom?	

B) Stakeholder Mapping
If a stakeholder mapping has not been done yet, or require an update, please do this in the next weeks, using the attached tool (*D2.2 Optional Tool Stakeholder Mapping*).

We understand that under WP1 and WP4, a Urban Food Policy Mapping, has been undertaken. Please do share this information with us, as it is also relevant for WP2. – This will be sent in a separate attachment
We will discuss with you in the meeting this policy overview and further analysis.
Attached a format for presenting these policies (*D2.2 Food Policy Action Canvas MUFPP tool*) for your information.

C) main Multi Actor Platform(s)
Regarding Deliverable 2.3, but also in relation to assuring you have a verification meeting with the MSP or Core team of your city, we would like you to:

Inform us on the main platform you would like to align the AfriFoodLinks project in your city, and what planning of meeting. This to: provide info on the main lead/core team members of this platform; when the next meeting of this platform is planned; and (if available), what the main agenda.

-Multi Actor Platform: Name
-Next Meeting: date
-Agenda:

D) Municipality Priorities and Governance Research Issues
And finally, we like to start discussing the issues on Governance you see as important for further research for AfriFOODLinks in your city.
A short list will do, but feel free to expand a little.
Some of you have suggested an experiment/pilot under WP4 on Governance. Please provide details.

Priority actions related to Urban Food Systems in your city

Main Governance related issues

For discussion in our meeting…

AfriFOODLinks

WP2 D2.2 Évaluation de la gouvernance urbaine, questions détaillées et formats

Un Rapid Scan a été réalisé à travers une auto-évaluation assistée des villes, suivant les 5 points clés répertoriés dans la méthodologie et repris par 5 du Cadre d'Action du MUFPP, qui sont :

1 : Présence d'un organisme gouvernemental municipal interdépartementale actif pour le conseil et la prise de décision en matière de politiques et de programmes alimentaires (par exemple, un groupe de travail interministériel sur l'alimentation, un bureau de politique alimentaire, une équipe alimentaire)
2 : Présence d'une plateforme de planification multipartite des politique alimentaires (par exemple, conseils de politique alimentaire, partenariats alimentaires, coalitions alimentaires)
3 : Présence d'une politique ou d'une stratégie alimentaire urbaine municipale et/ou de plans d'action
4 : Présence d'un inventaire des initiatives et pratiques alimentaires locales pour guider l'élaboration et l'expansion des politiques et programmes municipaux en matière d'alimentation urbaine.
5 : Présence d'un mécanisme de collecte et d'analyse des données sur le système alimentaire urbain pour suivre/évaluer et éclairer l'élaboration des politiques municipales sur les politiques alimentaires urbaines

Vous pouvez en savoir plus sur ces points d'action sur :
https://www.milanurbanfoodpolicypact.org/framework-for-action/
Ou en pièce jointe : D2.2 Outil d'actions MUFPP.

A) Aperçu plus détaillé des points d'action en matière de gouvernance du MUFPP

Nous vous remercions pour votre scan qui était assez complet et détaillé. Pour avancer plus en profondeur, cherchez à répondre aux questions soulevées dans le suivant questionnaire. Nous pourrons également discuter et finaliser ensemble lors d'une courte réunion proposée pour la semaine du 6 novembre.

Questionnaire:
1 : Présence d'un organisme gouvernemental municipal de coordination interdépartementale actif pour le conseil et la prise de décision en matière de politiques et de programmes alimentaires.
Donnez un résumé de la situation du cet organisme pour la ville de Tunis :

Ensuite : Veuillez remplir le formulaire suivant concernant l'organisme de coordination ou l'organisme gouvernemental interministériel. Si ces informations sont disponibles dans un document ou un site Web, veuillez envoyer ou fournir le lien. Si votre ville n'en dispose pas, veuillez indiquer quels acteurs potentiels pourraient y être impliqués.

A) Représentation dans le corps de coordination de différents secteurs / départements (au sein du gouvernement de la ville: intégration horizontale)

Liste et nombre de secteurs différents, participants et leurs rôles	
Énumérer les secteurs non engagés qui devraient l'être à l'avenir	
b) Représentation au sein de l'organisme de coordination intégrant d'autres niveaux de gouvernement (niveaux local, national et intergouvernemental : intégration verticale)	
Liste et nombre d'autres niveaux de gouvernement participants et leurs rôles	
Énumérer les gouvernements/niveaux non engagés qui devraient être impliqués à l'avenir	
c) L'organisme de coordination coordonne-t-il les plans de travail, etc. avec d'autres gouvernements aux niveaux local, national et intergouvernemental ?	
Liste et nombre d'autres niveaux de gouvernement engagés et formes de coordination	
Énumérer les gouvernements/niveaux non engagés qui devraient être impliqués à l'avenir	
d) L'organisme de coordination coordonne-t-il les plans de travail, etc. avec d'autres parties prenantes non gouvernementales (groupes de la société civile, recherche, secteur privé) ?	
Liste et nombre d'autres parties prenantes non gouvernementales engagées et formes de coordination	
Liste et nombre d'autres parties prenantes non gouvernementales non impliquées qui devraient l'être à l'avenir	
e) Votre évaluation du fonctionnement de cet organisme de coordination : en ce qui concerne la cohérence des politiques et programmes alimentaires urbains, des interventions et des collaborations, ou dans la formulation et la mise en œuvre de politiques et programmes alimentaires urbains intersectoriels :	
Mandat/Termes de référence	
Indiquez la décision politique et/ou la loi institutionnalisant l'organisme et son statut actuel.	
Indiquer les niveaux d'intégration dans les budgets et programmes institutionnels	
Nombre et type de réunions tenues et points de l'ordre du jour discutés	
Effectifs et temps consacré	
Montant et source du budget disponible pour le fonctionnement de l'organe de coordination	
Nombre et types de collaborations programmatiques sur l'alimentation (entre 2 départements ou plus) et d'autres initiatives/politiques municipales conçues, mises en œuvre ou planifiées.	

2) Présence d'une plateforme de planification multipartite des politique alimentaires

Donnez un résumé de la situation du cet organisme pour la ville de Tunis :
Veuillez remplir le formulaire suivant concernant la structure multipartite.
-Si votre ville dispose de différentes plateformes, merci de remplir ce formulaire pour chaque plateforme. Et

Indiquez sur quelle plateforme vous suggérez qu'AfriFOODLinks devrait se concentrer.
-Si votre ville n'en dispose pas, veuillez indiquer quels acteurs potentiels devraient y être impliqués.

Plateforme, nom et brève description

a) Représentation dans la Plateforme Multipartite / Organe des différents Secteurs / Départements (au sein du gouvernement municipal : intégration horizontale)	
Liste et nombre de différents secteurs participants et leurs rôles(voir également la liste dans l'outil Cartographie des parties prenantes)	
Liste des secteurs non engagés qui pourraient être impliqués à l'avenir	
b) Représentation au sein de la Plateforme multipartite / Organe des autres niveaux de gouvernement (niveaux local, national et intergouvernemental : intégration verticale	
Liste et nombre d'autres niveaux de gouvernement participants et leurs rôles	
Énumérer les gouvernements/niveaux non engagés qui pourraient être impliqués à l'avenir	
c) La plate-forme/l'organisme multipartite compte-t-il avec la participation d'autres parties prenantes non gouvernementales (groupes de la société civile, recherche, secteur privé) et la représentation des groupes vulnérables ?	
Liste et nombre de parties prenantes non gouvernementales	
Liste et nombre de groupes vulnérables spécifiques (jeunes, femmes, migrants, consommateurs/producteurs à faible revenu)	
d) Votre évaluation du fonctionnement de cette plateforme/organisme multipartite : assure-t-il la cohérence des interventions en matière de politiques et de programmes alimentaires urbains et la collaboration dans la formulation et la mise en œuvre de politiques et de programmes alimentaires urbains intersectoriels ?	
Organisation hôte (le cas échéant)	
Mandat/Termes de référence	
Indiquez la décision politique et/ou la loi institutionnalisant l'organisme et son statut actuel.	
Indiquer les niveaux d'intégration dans les budgets et programmes institutionnels	
Nombre et type de réunions tenues et points de l'ordre du jour discutés (les rapports sont-ils publics et disponibles ?)	
Effectifs et temps consacré	

Montant et source du budget disponible pour le fonctionnement de l'organe de coordination	
Nombre et types de collaborations programmatiques sur l'alimentation (entre 2 départements ou plus) et d'autres initiatives/politiques municipales conçues, mises en œuvre ou planifiées.	
Mécanismes, outils et rapports de suivi	

3. Présence d'un cadre de politique alimentaire urbaine municipale ou de stratégie (ou plans d'action).

Donnez un résumé de la situation d'une politique alimentaire urbaine pour la ville de Tunis et, si possible, liste et cadre des stratégies avec un lien web

Veuillez remplir le formulaire suivant sur le cadre ou la stratégie de politique alimentaire urbaine disponible.

Si votre ville ne fait que l'appliquer partiellement ou si elle est en train de la planifier, vous pouvez remplir la section pertinente; Si votre ville ne l'a pas et qu'il n'est pas en train de la planifier, vous pouvez présenter les documents les plus pertinents existants sur ce secteur et utiliser cette question pour les analyser.

Veuillez également indiquer le lien des actions au programme AfrifoodLinks

NOM Cadre ou stratégie de politique alimentaire	
La politique alimentaire urbaine est-elle totalement ou partiellement appliquée ?	
Existe-t-il un budget spécifique pour la politique alimentaire urbaine ? Si oui, quelle institution/département le finance-t-il ?	
La politique alimentaire urbaine est-elle accessible au public ? Si oui, où (publié sur papier, sur internet, etc.) ?	
Comment a été conçue la politique alimentaire urbaine (procédures, acteurs impliqués, etc.) ?	
Quels sont les principaux objectifs affichés ?	
Lesquels de ces éléments s'alignent sur le projet AfriFOODLinks ?	
Quels mesures/instruments politiques sont effectivement appliqués ?	

4. Présence d'un inventaire des initiatives et pratiques alimentaires locales pour guider l'élaboration et l'expansion des politiques et programmes municipaux en matière d'alimentation urbaine

Donnez un résumé à propose de l'inventaire des initiatives et pratiques alimentaires pour la ville de Tunis

Veuillez remplir le formulaire suivant concernant l'inventaire des initiatives alimentaires locales. si votre ville n'en dispose pas et qu'elle n'est pas en train de le planifier, vous pouvez présenter les documents les plus pertinents existant sur ce secteur et utiliser cette question pour les analyser.

L'inventaire est-il utilisé pour guider le développement et l'expansion des politiques et programmes alimentaires urbains municipaux ?	
Un budget spécifique pour le développement et la mise à jour de l'inventaire est-il mis à la disposition par la ville des ONG/instituts de recherche locaux ?	
L'inventaire est-il accessible au public pour une utilisation par toute partie prenante gouvernementale ou non gouvernementale ?	

Quelles autres formes de gouvernance - formelles et informelles - liées à l'alimentation urbaine ou à l'environnement alimentaire urbain pourriez-vous mentionner, qui ne sont pas présentes dans ce qui précède, comme les festivals, les groupes d'épargne et de crédit, les associations de marché, etc.

Lister...

5. Présence d'un mécanisme de collecte et d'analyse des données sur le système alimentaire urbain pour suivre/évaluer et éclairer l'élaboration des politiques municipales sur les politiques alimentaires urbaines

Donnez un résumé à propose du mécanisme de collecte et d'analyse des données sur le système alimentaire pour la ville de Tunis

Veuillez remplir le formulaire suivant concernant le mécanisme de collecte et d'analyse des données sur le système alimentaire urbain. Si votre ville n'en dispose pas et qu'elle n'est pas en train de le planifier, vous pouvez présenter les documents les plus pertinents existant sur ce secteur et utiliser cette question pour les analyser.

Le mécanisme de suivi/évaluation est-il utilisé pour appuyer la formulation des politiques alimentaires urbaines ? Si oui, comment ?	
Hôte, Organe de Coordination de ce mécanisme	
Le mécanisme de suivi/évaluation est-il utilisé pour évaluer les progrès de la mise en œuvre de la politique alimentaire ? Si oui, comment ?	
Le mécanisme de suivi/évaluation est-il utilisé pour évaluer les impacts des politiques alimentaires urbaines ? Si oui, comment ?	
Les données sont-elles collectées de manière désagrégée ? Si oui, comment ?	

B) Cartographie des parties prenantes

Si une cartographie des parties prenantes n'a pas encore été réalisée ou nécessite une mise à jour, veuillez le faire dans les prochaines semaines, en utilisant l'outil ci-joint (D2.2 Outil facultatif de cartographie des parties prenantes).

Nous comprenons que dans le cadre des WP1 et WP4, une cartographie des politiques alimentaires urbaines a été entreprise. Veuillez partager ces informations avec nous, car elles sont également pertinentes pour WP2.

Nous discuterons avec vous lors de la réunion de cet aperçu politique et d'une analyse plus approfondie.
Ci-joint un format pour présenter ces politiques (outil MUFPP D2.2 Food Policy Action Canvas) pour votre information.

C) Plateforme(s) multi-acteur(s) principale(s)

Concernant le Livrable 2.3, mais également pour vous assurer d'avoir une réunion de vérification avec le MSP ou l'équipe de votre ville, nous aimerions que vous :

Informez-nous de la plateforme principale sur laquelle vous souhaitez aligner le projet AfriFoodLinks dans votre ville, et du planning de réunion. Ceci pour : fournir des informations sur les principaux membres de l'équipe principale/responsable de cette plateforme ; quand est prévue la prochaine réunion de cette plaeforme ; et (si disponible), quel est l'ordre du jour principal.
-Plateforme multi-acteurs : Nom
-Prochaine réunion : date
-Ordre du jour:

D) Priorités des municipalités et enjeux de recherche sur la gouvernance

Et enfin, nous aimerions commencer à discuter des questions sur la gouvernance que vous considérez comme importantes pour la poursuite des recherches pour AfriFOODLinks dans votre ville.
Une courte liste fera l'affaire, mais n'hésitez pas à l'élargir un peu.
Certains d'entre vous ont suggéré une expérience/pilote dans le cadre du WP4 sur la gouvernance. Prière de fournir des détails.
Donnez, si possible, des indications sur les actions prioritaires liées aux systèmes alimentaires urbains dans votre ville
Donnez, si possible, des indications sur les principales questions liées à la gouvernance

Annex 2. Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso

A) More detailed overview of MUFPP governance action points

Check your city's draft city surface analysis summary (see below and text added by point: 1-5). This follows the MUFPP's 5 key action points on governance. Please correct errors, add information and links to key documents when answering these questions.

- **Governance mechanisms**
The city does not have a global governance strategy, but isolated actions.
1) **City level committee/department/staff dedicated to food policy**
No dedicated team yet, the planning and studies department has taken the lead. In the past, it was a central point, but today, everyone has a small part in it.
2) **Multi-stakeholder platform responsible for advice and decision-making regarding the formulation and/or implementation of food policies**
There is an exchange platform within the Rikolto Program.
- **Mechanisms for coordination and interaction between platforms**
None
3) **Food strategy**
There is no strategy adopted, but a reference document to show everything that is done at the municipal level.
4) **Existence of recent stakeholder mapping**
As part of the AfriFOODlinks (Rikolto, ACRA, Mani Tese, AFPPME, ADEU, IRSAT, INADES formation, Consumer League, La Saisonnière, Beonere , Sena bio, Federation of market gardeners).

- **Programs related to food systems transformation currently underway in the city**
None
- **Partnership with projects/programs linked to the food system**
MUFPP
- Recent political analysis of the urban food system
None

Now look to answer the questions raised in the following questionnaire. We will also be able to discuss and finalize together during a short meeting proposed for the week of November 6.

Quiz :
1: ***Presence of an active interdepartmental coordinating municipal government body for advice and decision-making on food policies and programs.***
Give a summary of the situation of this organization for the city of Ouagadougou:
There is no municipal body responsible for food policies and programs.
Nevertheless :
In 2018, the Municipality of Ouagadougou began actions to revalorize the green belt previously abandoned during anarchic occupation. Among these actions, the promotion of the green belt is included to make reforestation effective and at the same time make this

space an economic centre with ecological activities. The Foresight, Planning and Studies Department of Ouagadougou City Hall was therefore on the front line to implement activities to revalorize this green belt. This is how today, without officially, in its organization chart it is indicated a mission of this type to be the municipal structure in terms of advice and decision-making in matters of food policies and programs.
Also the hygiene department of the Town Hall takes care of hygiene control in the city's restaurants.
Also at the level of the central region (region housing the Municipality of Ouagadougou), the governorate has within it a consultation framework on food security in the region and the members of this framework meet every six months to discuss food security In the region.
Then: Please complete the following form regarding the coordinating body or interdepartmental government body. If this information is available in a document or website, please send or provide the link. If your city does not have one, please indicate which potential actors could be involved.

A) Representation in the coordinating body of different sectors/departments (within city government: horizontal integration)	
List and number of different departments/actors, participants and their roles	The Foresight, Planning and Studies Department (DPPE) of the Town Hall for carrying out the activities; The Town Hall hygiene service for quality control in restaurants NGOs and partner structures for implementing activities to promote sustainable and healthy urban food.
List unengaged departments/actors who should be engaged in the future	In the future it is desirable to have a single direction at the Town Hall level which deals with these issues and which coordinates activities with technical and financial partners.
b) Representation within the coordinating body integrating other levels of government (local, national and intergovernmental levels: vertical integration)	
List and number of other participating levels of government and their roles	The food issue is quite disparate within the State. We have the Ministry of Agriculture for monitoring the achievement of food security; the Ministry of Health for questions of nutrition and the Ministry of Economy and Finance for questions of financing and creation of growth poles. At the regional level, it is the governorate which ensures the coordination of the consultation framework on food security.
List unengaged governments/levels that should be involved in the future.	Certain actors are often associated on an occasional or informal basis. These are: the federation of market gardeners and nursery growers headquartered in Ouagadougou, the customary authorities, the Provincial Directorate of Agriculture, the regional chamber of agriculture, the provincial directorate of water and forests.
c) Does the coordinating body coordinate work plans, etc.? with other governments at local, national and intergovernmental levels?	

List and number of other levels of government involved and forms of coordination	Regarding the coordination of the work plan, apart from the activity program of each of the ministries which often integrates activities related to food security in its work plan, there is no common implementation of a shared action plan. On the other hand, Decree No. 2003-670/PRES/PM/MAECR/MFB/MEDEV adopting the framework General State-Partner Cooperation in Food Security is a body that generally meets in the event of a food emergency.
List unengaged governments/levels that should be involved in the future	The implementation of this framework should integrate several sectors: agriculture, health, environment, trade, NGOs and non-state actors. Decree No. 2003-670/PRES/PM/MAECR/MFB/MEDEV could be adjusted to integrate more structure and better guide the missions.
d) Does the coordinating body coordinate work plans, etc.? with other non-governmental stakeholders (civil society groups, research, private sector)?	
List and number of other engaged non-governmental stakeholders and forms of coordination.	Without being certain that the frame is still functional, it is necessary to remember its composition: - The Minister responsible for Agriculture, - The Minister responsible for Fisheries Resources - The Minister responsible for Foreign Affairs and Regional Cooperation - The Minister responsible for Finance and Budget, - The Minister responsible for Territorial Administration and Decentralization, - The Minister responsible for Social Action, - The Minister Responsible for Animal Resources, - The Minister responsible for the Economy and Development, - The Minister responsible for Commerce, - The Minister responsible for Public Health - The Minister responsible for Information - Those responsible for the Technical Structures of the food safety system. Under Civil Society - Two representatives of Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), - Two (2) representatives of Consumer Associations, - Two (2) representatives of the Confédération Paysanne du Faso, - Two (2) representatives of the Association of Municipalities of Burkina Faso, - Two (2) representatives of the Chamber of Commerce, Industry and Crafts, - Two (2) representatives of the Chambers of Agriculture.

	- Two (2) representatives of Importers and Manufacturers of Inputs, - Two (2) representatives of Cereal Traders, - Two (2) representatives of livestock traders' organizations - Two (2) representatives of Agri-Food Processing Industrialists, - Two (2) representatives of Financial Institutions. - Two (2) representatives of Product Trader Organizations Agri-food, - Two (2) representatives of Carrier Organizations The Ambassador Head of the Delegation of the European Commission - The French Ambassador to Burkina Faso - The Ambassador of the Kingdom of the Netherlands - The Ambassador of the Federal Republic of Germany - The Ambassador of the Kingdom of Denmark - The Ambassador of the Republic of Italy - The Representative of the World Food Program (WFP) - The Executive Secretary of the Permanent Inter-State Committee for the Fight against Drought in the Sahel (CILSS) - The Representative of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) in Burkina Faso
List and number of other non-governmental stakeholders not involved who should be involved in the future	As part of the implementation of consultation frameworks, it is important that the municipalities are involved.
e) Your assessment of the functioning of this coordinating body: with regard to the coherence of urban food policies and programs, interventions and collaborations, or in the formulation and implementation of cross-sectoral urban food policies and programs:	
Mandate/Terms of reference	This organization only seems to intervene in emergencies.
Indicate the political decision and/or law institutionalizing the organization and its current status.	Decree No. 2003-670/PRES/PM/MAECR/MFB/MEDEV
Indicate levels of integration in institutional budgets and programs	Unknown
Number and type of meetings held and agenda items discussed	Unknown
Numbers and time spent	About fifty people
Amount and source of budget available for the operation of the coordinating body	Unknown
Number and types of programmatic collaborations on food (between 2 or more departments) and other	At the ministry level, the level of collaboration is not known. On the other hand, at the municipal level, this collaboration is almost non-existent.

municipal initiatives/policies designed, implemented or planned.	

2) Presence of a multi-stakeholder food policy planning platform

Give a summary of the situation of this organization for the city of Ouagadougou:

To date, there is no formal platform of this kind in the municipality of Ouagadougou. However, NGOs such as Mani Tese, ACRA and Rikolto intervene alongside Town Hall (in particular with the prospective, planning and studies department) to carry out activities aimed ultimately at developing an inclusive food policy.

Please complete the following form regarding the multi-stakeholder structure.

- *If your city has different platforms, please complete this form for each platform. And Indicate which platform you suggest AfriFOODLinks should focus on.*
- If your city does not have one, please indicate which potential actors should be involved .

Platform, name and brief description

a) Representation in the Multi-Party Platform / Body of different Sectors / Departments (within municipal government: horizontal integration)	
List and number of different participating sectors and their roles (see also the list in the Stakeholder Mapping tool)	Non-existent
List of uncommitted sectors that could be involved in the future	*Department of Foresight, Planning and Studies (DPPE), ADEU, Directorate of Health Services, Directorate of Education Services, General Directorate of Resources, General Directorate of Municipal Police, Directorate of Parks and Landscaping.*
b) Representation within the Multi-stakeholder Platform / Body of other levels of government (local, national and intergovernmental levels: vertical integration	
List and number of other participating levels of government and their roles	
List unengaged governments/levels that may be involved in the future	Provincial Directorate of Agriculture, Regional Chamber of Agriculture, Provincial Directorate of the Environment.
c) Does the multi-stakeholder platform/body include the participation of other non-governmental stakeholders (civil society groups, research, private sector) and representation of vulnerable groups?	
List and number of non-governmental stakeholders	

List and number of specific vulnerable groups (youth, women, migrants, low-income consumers/producers)	**NGO ACRA, Rikolto, Mani Tese, Municipal Youth Council,** federation of market gardeners and nursery growers
d) Your assessment of the functioning of this multi-stakeholder platform/body: does it ensure coherence of interventions in urban food policies and programs and collaboration in the formulation and implementation of intersectoral urban food policies and programs ?	
Host organization (if applicable)	
Mandate/Terms of reference	Néant
Indicate the political decision and/or law institutionalizing the organization and its current status.	None
Indicate levels of integration in institutional budgets and programs	None
Number and type of meetings held and agenda items discussed (are reports public and available?)	None
Numbers and time spent	None
Amount and source of budget available for the operation of the coordinating body	None
Number and types of programmatic collaborations on food (between 2 or more departments) and other municipal initiatives/policies designed, implemented or planned.	None
Monitoring mechanisms, tools and reports	None

3. Presence of a municipal urban food policy framework or strategy (or action plans).

Give a summary of the situation of an urban food policy for the city of Ouagadougou and, if possible, list and frame the strategies with a WEB link

Please complete the following urban food policy framework or strategy form available.

If your city is only partially implementing it or is planning it, you can fill in the relevant section; If your city does not have it and is not planning it, you can present the most relevant existing documents on this sector and use this question to analyze them.

Please also indicate the link of the actions to the AfrifoodLinks program

NAME Food policy framework or strategy	
Is the urban food policy fully or partially implemented?	For the moment the commune of Ouagadougou does not have an urban food policy.
Is there a specific budget for urban food policy? If yes, which institution/department funds it?	None
Is urban food policy accessible to the public? If yes, where (published on paper, on the internet, etc.)?	None
How was the urban food policy designed (procedures, actors involved, etc.) ?	None
What are the main stated objectives?	None
Which of these elements align with the AfriFOODLinks project?	None
What policy measures/instruments are actually applied?	None

4. Presence of an inventory of local food initiatives and practices to guide the development and expansion of municipal policies and programs regarding urban food

Give a summary of the inventory of food initiatives and practices for the city of Ouagadougou

Please complete the following form regarding the inventory of local food initiatives. If your city does not have one and is not planning it, you can present the most relevant documents existing on this sector and use this question to analyze them.

The city of Ouagadougou does not have an inventory of local food initiatives . On the other hand, it has a directory of structures which invest in the green belt as part of the redevelopment project that the Town Hall has started since 2018.

Is the inventory used to guide the development and expansion of municipal urban food policies and programs?	-
Is a specific budget for developing and updating the inventory made available by the city to local NGOs/research institutes?	-
Is the inventory publicly available for use by any governmental or non-governmental stakeholders?	-

What other forms of governance - formal and informal - related to urban food or the urban food environment could you mention, that are not present in the above, such as festivals, savings and credit groups , market associations, etc.

List…

- **The foodTERRE festival**
- **The month of eating local**

5. Presence of a mechanism for collecting and analyzing data on the urban food system to monitor/evaluate and inform the development of municipal policies on urban food policies

Provide a proposed summary of the food system data collection and analysis mechanism for the city of Ouagadougou.
At the moment there is no mechanism for collecting data on food security in the city of Ouagadougou.

Please complete the following form regarding the urban food system data collection and analysis mechanism. If your city does not have one and is not planning it, you can present the most relevant documents existing on this sector and use this question to analyze them.

Is the monitoring/evaluation mechanism used to support the formulation of urban food policies? If yes, how ?	
Host, Coordinating Body of this mechanism	
Is the monitoring/evaluation mechanism used to assess progress in food policy implementation? If yes, how ?	
Is the monitoring/evaluation mechanism used to assess the impacts of urban food policies? If yes, how ?	
Is the data collected in a disaggregated manner? If yes, how ?	

B) Stakeholder mapping
If a stakeholder mapping has not yet been completed or requires updating, please do so in the coming weeks, using the attached tool (D2.2 Optional Stakeholder Mapping Tool). See MAIGA
We understand that as part of WP1 and WP4, a mapping of urban food policies was undertaken. Please share this information with us, as it is also relevant for WP2. See MAIGA
We will discuss this policy overview and further analysis with you at the meeting.
Attached is a format for presenting these policies (MUFPP D2.2 Food Policy Action Canvas tool) for your information.

C) Main multi-actor platform(s)
Regarding Deliverable 2.3, but also to ensure you have a verification meeting with the MSP or your city team, we would like you to:

Let us know the main platform on which you would like to align the AfriFoodLinks project in your city, and the meeting schedule. This is to: provide information on the main members of the core team/responsible for this platform; when is the next meeting of this platform planned; and (if available), what the main agenda is.
-Multi-actor platform: Name
-Next meeting: date
-Agenda :

D) Priorities of municipalities and research issues on governance

And finally, we would like to start discussing the governance issues that you consider important for further research for AfriFOODLinks in your city.

A short list will do, but feel free to expand it a bit.

Some of you suggested an experiment/pilot as part of WP4 on governance. Please provide details.

Provide, if possible, indications on priority actions related to urban food systems in your city

Where possible, provide guidance on key governance issues

Annex 3. Kisumu, Kenya

For the numbering (A-D) below, we also refer to the mail sent to you:

A) Further Detailed Overview following MUFPP Governance Action Points
Check the draft city surface scan summary of your city (see below, we added text per point: 1-5). This follows the MUFPP 5 key points of action on Governance.

Please *Correct* mistakes, *Add information and links* of key documents, in answering these questions. Then please, seek to reply the questions raised, in the tables.

Questionnaire:

1: Presence of an active municipal Coordinating or interdepartmental government body for advisory and decision making of food policies and programmes

-Before 2010 Kisumu municipality was a separate unit. After the new Kenyan Constitution in 2010, Kisumu city is in a county: there are different levels of government; the county is wider and the city functions as a department.
-There is no specific department at the city level. That coordinates Urban Food, or the FLACK.
-But there is the Kisumu-County-Food-System-Strategy-2023-2027 (see under point 3).
→ How is this coordinated, implemented, budgeted, etc.
The strategy is domiciled in the County Government Department of Agriculture. There is no specific budget for implementation of the strategy, but different government departments with relevant mandates contribute to strategy implementation. The departments (Agriculture, Fisheries, Livestock, Trade, Public health, nutrition, etc) have annual workplans and budgets that contribute to the strategy.

-However, the County level technical departments all have a mandate that is related to Urban Food System (Departments of Trade, Public Health, Environment, City Planning, and Agriculture), and budgets accordingly.
-The City Planning unit, the (recent) City Master and Local land Use Plan are important. Urban Agriculture is mentioned.
-The City Inspectorate is key in enforcing county laws. Policy mapping and adaptation is with this department and the relevant Technical Dept.
→ How are linkages made with surrounding Counties.
Linkages with other surrounding counties are through the Lake Region Economic Block, that brings together 14 counties in the Lake Victoria Region.
→ How are linkages made to other actors, stakeholder.
Linkages with other stakeholders are through multistakeholder forums, currently convened under FLAG (Food Liaison Advisory Group)

Then: Please fill the following form about the Coordinating Body or Interdepartmental Government Body.
If this information is available in a document or website, please send or provide the link.
If your city does not have it, please indicate what potential actors might be involved on it.
https://www.kisumu.go.ke/kisumu-sets-pace-in-food-policy-formulation/#:~:text=The%20study%20presented%20to%20Food,high%20levels%20of%20food%20insecurity.
https://www.kisumu.go.ke/finalizing-on-the-kisumu-county-food-systems-strategy/

a) Representation in the Coordinating Body of different Sectors / Departments (within the city government: horizontal integration)	
List and number of different sectors, participating and their roles	1. Department of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries 2. Department of Urban and Physical Planning 3. Department of Environment 4. Department of Trade and Cooperatives 5. Department of Public Health 6. Department of nutrition
List sectors not engaged that should be involved in future	1. City Manager
b) Representation in the Coordinating Body integrate of other level Governments (local, national and intergovernmental levels: vertical integration)	
List and number of other levels of governments participating and their roles	The same departments at the county and city levels (The city is a subset of the county)
List governments/ levels not engaged that should be involved in future	
c) Does the Coordinating Body coordinates actions work plans, etc. with other governments at local, national and intergovernmental level?	
List and number of other levels of governments engaged and forms of coordination	County and city levels (The city is a subset of the county).
List governments/ levels not engaged that should be involved in future	
d) Does the Coordinating Body coordinates actions work plans, etc. with other non-governmental stakeholders (civil society groups, research, private sector)?	
List and number of other non-governmental stakeholders engaged and forms of coordination	1. Residents associations 2. Farmer Associations 3. Maseno University / academia 4. Civil Society – Practical Action
List and number of other non-governmental stakeholders not engaged that should be engaged in future	1. Trader associations (food distributors, retailers, supermarkets).
e) Your assessment of the functioning of this coordinating body: in relation to coherence of urban food policy and programme interventions and collaborates, or in the formulation and implementation of cross-sectoral urban food policies and programmes:	
Mandate/ Terms of Reference	FLAG - a multi-stakeholder governance mechanism to promote dialogue and propose recommendations to local governments on priority actions to be implemented in urban areas.
Indicate the policy decision and/or law institutionalising the body and its current statute	The body (FLAG) is currently not instituted by law, plans are underway to institute it.
Indicate levels of integration in institutional budgets and programmes	Not budgeted for. Depended on donor (FAO) funding which has ended.
Number and type of meetings held and agenda points discussed	

Staff numbers and time dedicated	No dedicated staff
Amount and source of budget available for the functioning of the coordination body	None
Number and types of programmatic collaborations on food (between 2 or more departments) and other city initiatives/policies designed, implemented or planned.	One – Food Systems Strategy
Monitoring mechanisms, tools and reports	None
Information and outreach mechanisms and target groups	None

2. Presence of an active multi-stakeholder food policy and planning structure

Notes from Rapid Scan:

In the meeting it was said that there is not an active Multi Actor Platform, nor Planning structure.
→ This may be key point of attention
Clarification: FLAG exists at the County level, but there is none specific to the city
There is of course the Kisumu-County-Food-System-Strategy-2023-2027, FLACK and the County meetings.
→ How does this function, please explain, and suggest the necessary changes.
FLAG is convened by the department of agriculture, and has a productionist bias. There is need for a Multi stakeholder forum specific to the city, with city stakeholders, including actors at all stages of the urban food system

Also found in literature:

*) Process for Establishing a Multi-Stakeholder Forum for Climate Action and Promoting Circular Food Systems in Kisumu, Kenya, Scaling up and Empowering Movements for Climate Change Advocacy (**SEMCCA**): https://africa.iclei.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/SEMCCA-Kisumu-Roadmap_WEB-Vanessa-Tshite.pdf The SEMCCA project in Kisumu focused on the urban food system as an entry point to engage with civil society, local authorities, and private sector actors to promote a circular food system for climate action. Has this led to any further action?
This did not lead to any further action. However, it was recommended that the MSF be instituted under KLIP.
*) Kisumu Local Interaction Platform KLIP

→ Please comment/explain further.
KLIP is a good model of MSF but has not been very active in recent years due to lack of funding.

And further information:

Please fill the following form about the multi-stakeholder structure.
-If your city has different platforms, please fill this form in for each platform. And
Indicate which platform you suggest AfriFOODLinks should focus on.
-If your city does not have it, please indicate what potential actors should be involved in it.

Platform, name and short description: - Food Liaison Advisory Group (FLAG)

a) Representation in the Multi-stakeholder Platform / Body of different Sectors / Departments (within the city government: horizontal integration)	
List and number of different sectors participating and their roles (also see the list in the Tool Stakeholder Mapping)	1. Department of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries 2. Department of Urban and Physical Planning 3. Department of Environment 4. Department of Trade and Cooperatives 5. Department of Public Health 6. Department of nutrition
List sectors not engaged that could be involved in future	
b) Representation in the Multi-stakeholder Platform / Body of other levels governments (local, national and intergovernmental levels: vertical integration)	
List and number of other levels of governments participating and their roles	County Government, City Government
List governments/ levels not engaged that could be involved in future	
c) Does the Multi-stakeholder Platform / Body counts with participation of other non-governmental stakeholders (civil society groups, research, private sector) and representation of vulnerable groups	
List and number of non-governmental stakeholders	1. Residents associations 2. Farmer Associations 3. Maseno University / academia 4. Civil Society – Practical Action
List and number of specific vulnerable groups (youth, women, migrants, low-income category consumers/producers)	None
d) Your assessment of the functioning of this Multi-stakeholder Platform / Body: does it ensure coherence of urban food policy and programme interventions and collaboration in the formulation and implementation of cross-sectoral urban food policies and programmes?	
Host organisation (if applicable): County Government of Kisumu, Department of Agriculture	
Mandate/ Terms of Reference	To promote dialogue and propose recommendations to local governments on priority actions to be implemented in urban areas.
Indicate the policy decision and/or law institutionalising the body and its current statute	None
Indicate levels of integration in institutional budgets and programmes	None
Number and type of meetings held and agenda points discussed (are reports public and available?)	No reports are publicly available
Staff numbers and time dedicated	No dedicated staff
Amount and source of budget available for the functioning of the coordination body	None
Number and types of programmatic collaborations on food (between 2 or more departments) and other city initiatives/policies designed, implemented or planned.	None

Monitoring mechanisms, tools and reports	None
Information and outreach mechanisms and target groups	None

3. Presence of a municipal urban food policy framework or strategy (or action plans).

* Kisumu-County-Food-System-Strategy-2023-2027: https://www.kisumu.go.ke/wp-content/uploads/KISUMU-COUNTY-FOOD-SYSTEM-STRATEGY-2023-2027.pdf
Key challenges: weak institutional and food system governance
→ Please elaborate on this…
The Strategy further identified: low production, underdeveloped post-harvest handling and value addition, poor infrastructure system, poor access to markets, Information and Communication Technology (ICT) and food safety. And as cross cutting challenges: climate change, food loss and waste management, social protection, environmental protection, cultural and social mainstreaming.

Key thematic areas geared towards supporting the food system by strengthening the Food system governance: Production, Post-harvest handling and value addition, Infrastructure development; Market access and ICT; Nutrition, food safety and health and mainstreaming Cross Cutting issues.
Key objectives have been identified towards realizing the intended outcome of a sustainable food system:
i) To formulate appropriate regulatory instruments that supports implementation of the policies;
ii) To strengthen production, post-harvest-handling and value addition of all agricultural produce;
iii) To develop, improve and expand basic physical structures, network and facilities that support sustainable food systems;
iv) To enhance reliable agri-food market access and market information;
v) To guide and enhance access to healthy, nutritious and safe food in Kisumu County;
vi) To attain consistent food and nutrition security for county residents while safeguarding the commercial interests and mainstreaming cross-cutting issues.

→ How does this relate to neighbouring Counties? N/a
→ And the FLAG – The strategy is a product of FLAG, that was donor driven
https://www.kisumu.go.ke/the-integrated-actions-for-innovative-food-systems-across-rural-urban-communities-project-closeout-meeting/
Hon. Onyango called on Food Liaison Advisory Council of Kisumu (FLACK) to remain active in enhancing a multi stakeholder collaborations and coordination in implementing the food systems strategy related interventions to upscale the successes gained to transform livelihoods.

→ And how are all the different projects in and around the county coordinated, or not?
The projects are coordinated through the County Agricultural Sector Steering Committee (CASSCOM), which also is biased towards production, and little focus on other actors in the urban food system.

And further information:

Please fill the following form about available urban food policy framework or strategy.

If your city is only partially applying it or it is in the process of planning it, you can fill the relevant section; if your city does not have it and it is not in the process of planning it, you can present the most relevant documents existing on this sector and use this question to analyse them.

Please also do indicate the link of actions to AfriFOODLinks Programme

NAME Food Policy Framework or Strategy	
Is the urban food policy fully or partially applied?	No
Is there a specific budget for the urban food policy? If yes, what is the institution/department funding it?	No.
Is the urban food policy publicly accessible? If yes, where (published on paper, on internet, etc)?	No
How was the urban food policy designed (procedures, actors involved, etc.)?	
What are the main objectives stated?	
Which of these align to the AfriFOODLinks Project?	
What policy measures/instruments are effectively applied?	
What measuring targets and tools have been set?	
Does the policy/strategy/action plan define which organisation will lead and coordinate the framework to facilitate its implementation and operational planning?	
Have sources of financing been clearly identified and assigned, and a timeframe defined to implement, coordinate and monitor the policy/strategy/action plan?	

4. Presence of an inventory of local food initiatives and practices to guide development and expansion of municipal urban food policy and programmes

None – reference in the food strategy, collection of other stakeholder mappings available

→ ?? Have there been undertaken stakeholder mapping exercises in the development of the County Strategy, KLIP, the FLACK, etc.??
If so please do give main references or upload documents. No document available

If not, see below under point B

And further information:
Please fill the following form about the inventory of local food initiatives. if your city does not have it and it is not in the process of planning it, you can present the most relevant documents existing on this sector and use this question to analyse them.

Is the inventory used to guide development and expansion of municipal urban food policy and programmes?	

Is a specific budget for developing and up-dating the inventory is made available by the city to local NGOs/research institutes?	
Is the inventory publicly accessible for use by any governmental or nongovernmental stakeholder?	

And
What other - formal and informal - forms of Governance related to Urban food or Urban food environment could you mention, which are not present in the above, like festivals, saving and loan groups, market associations, etc. …?

1. Market Trader Associations

5. Presence of a mechanism for assembling and analysing urban food system data to monitor/evaluate and inform municipal policy making on urban food policies

Your reply: No policy on urban food system was analyzed.

The urban food system and governance was however analyzed:
https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/oa-edit/10.4324/9781315191195-14/characteristics-urban-food-system-kisumu-kenya-paul-otieno-opiyo-harun-okello-ogindo ,
https://scholar.google.com/citations?view_op=view_citation&hl=en&user=GCR4B_UAAAAJ&citation_for_view=GCR4B_UAAAAJ:2osOgNQ5qMEC

→ What are the main issues coming out of this research?

- The urban food system is largely informal, posing challenges in governance.
- Government agencies have inadequate capacity to ensure food safety.
- Cartels control food trade in the major municipal markets
-

Also see under point D below.

Programs related to food systems transformation currently running in the city

1.Phase III Relief Food Distribution by the National Government in western Kenya. This is not specific to Kisumu City but to selected areas of the Country. Some parts of the county

2. The Milan Urban Food Policy Pact which has given rise to KFLACK. The objectives for Kisumu were food production and post-harvest losses, food safety, infrastructure development, market access, information and technology, mainstreaming cross-cutting issues. Key actors in this were FAO and County governments.

→ 3. There are many other programs. For instance BioVersity: HealthyFoodAfrica (EU funded).
Any links to AfriFOODLinks?

→ What are the main MUFPP Actions identified by Kisumu as relevant, and what work has been done so far?

→ What relation to FAO's Green Cities.

Further Comments in the Rapid Scan.
The urban food system plays an important role in the economy of Kisumu, but it presents infrastructural, governmental, financial and economic challenges. Food retail is a source of

employment and livelihood for many, particularly women, who traditionally are engaged in food provisioning, preparation, and marketing. Informal food retailers dominate the sector, enabling access to food by the poor. The urban food system is premised on a supply system that is dependent on distant production locations, which in turn introduces complex challenges in food supply including infrastructure, seasonality, middlemen and cartels, and price escalations. The current governance of food retail businesses for informal sector traders has been shown to fail to address the issues of infrastructure and service provision that would enhance food safety, lower supply prices, and improve preservation.

And further information:

Please fill the following form about the mechanism for assembling and analysing urban food system data. if your city does not have it and it is not in the process of planning it, you can present the most relevant documents existing on this sector and use this question to analyse them.
Could not identify a M& E mechanism for urban food policy

The monitoring/evaluation mechanism monitors is used to support the formulation of urban food policies? If yes how?	
Host, Coordinating Body of this mechanism	
The monitoring/evaluation mechanism monitors is used to assess the food policy implementation progress? If yes how?	
The monitoring/evaluation mechanism monitors is used to assess the impacts of the urban food policies? If yes how?	
Are the data collected in a disaggregated way? If yes how?	
Are the data shared with the other stakeholders? If yes with whom?	

B) Stakeholder Mapping
If a stakeholder mapping has not been done yet, or require an update, please do this in the next weeks, using the attached tool (*D2.2 Optional Tool Stakeholder Mapping*).

We understand that under WP1 and WP4, a Urban Food Policy Mapping, has been undertaken. Please do share this information with us, as it is also relevant for WP2.
We will discuss with you in the meeting this policy overview and further analysis.
Attached a format for presenting these policies (*D2.2 Food Policy Action Canvas MUFPP tool*) for your information.

C) main Multi Actor Platform(s)
Regarding Deliverable 2.3, but also in relation to assuring you have a verification meeting with the MSP or Core team of your city, we would like you to:

Inform us on the main platform you would like to align the AfriFoodLinks project in your city, and what planning of meeting. This to: provide info on the main lead/core team members of this platform; when the next meeting of this platform is planned; and (if available), what the main agenda.

-Multi Actor Platform: Name
-Next Meeting: date
-Agenda:

D) Municipality Priorities and Governance Research Issues
And finally, we like to start discussing the issues on Governance you see as important for further research for AfriFOODLinks in your city.
A short list will do, but feel free to expand a little.
Some of you have suggested an experiment/pilot under WP4 on Governance. Please provide details.

Priority actions related to Urban Food Systems in your city

Main Governance related issues

Annex 4. Mbale, Uganda

A) Further Detailed Overview following MUFPP Governance Action Points
Check the draft city surface scan summary of your city (see below, and the added text per point: 1-5). This follows the MUFPP 5 key points of action on Governance.

1) City-level committee/department/staff dedicated to Food Policy

The Mbale City Council (MCC) is in charge of food policy formulation and implementation in the city. Specifically, the staff in charge is the Head of Production who sits at the Council.

2) Multi-stakeholder platform responsible for advisory and decision-making regarding the formulation and/or implementation of food policies and programs

The **Good Food Council – GFC**: under the Rikolto funded project, it is a technical committee providing leadership in the implementation of the program interventions in Mbale City.

The **Good Food Parliament – GFP:** it serves as a Multi Stakeholder Platform with the objective of promoting and ensuring access to healthy, sustainable and equitable food systems within urban areas; facilitating collaboration and coordination among Food Systems Actors; fostering regular multi-stakeholder discussions.

The **Mbale City Food Systems Platform (MCFSP)** under Makerere University brings together all relevant players and stakeholders to prioritize Mbale's foodshed.

Mechanisms of coordination and interaction between platforms
Mbale City currently utilizes two multi-actor platforms, the **Good Food Parliament (GFP)** and the **Mbale City Food Systems Platform (MCFSP)**, as dialogue tools for advocating supportive policies and practices more so as knowledge sharing platforms.

Frequency of meetings
The **Good Food Council – GFC** meets on a monthly basis to develop monthly action plans that are implemented by responsible parties facilitated by partners. The Council holds monthly meetings to assess the implementation of actions from the previous interventions, define strategies, roles and prioritize tasks for smooth implementation. The next meeting for the Monthly Meeting and the Multi stakeholder meeting is planned to be held in September, 2023.

The multi stakeholder platform meetings under the **Good Food Parliament – GFP** are held twice in a year. This is mainly to create enough time for the Good Food Council to implement resolutions, enable partners to plan strategically fostering adaptability and strategic collaboration with not only the existing food systems actors but also new ones that have been identified during the process.
However, in the year 2023, three meetings were conducted including one for AfriFOODlinks project in November. The other two were held in July and October respectively under the Good Food for Cities Program.

3) Food strategy

Mbale City has no Food Strategy.
This implies that the City lack coordinated efforts to address issues such as food production, distribution, nutrition, and food safety within Mbale City. However, the AfriFOODlinks in collaboration with the City leadership and other partners and stakeholders are in the process of developing a framework to guide urban food systems related interventions in Mbale.

4) Recent stakeholder mapping

List:https://docs.google.com/document/d/1puf1GlmxNipq2oNyEnndBHtaGBDORcTH/edit?usp=sharing&ouid=111059662431231707605&rtpof=true&sd=true (*this is still being improved by Partners and City Council through the Chief Mobilizer*)

5) Recent Policy Analysis of the urban Food System

There is very little Information on Policy analysis of the urban FS in Mbale City.
https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1303303/FULLTEXT01.pdf
https://docs.google.com/document/d/1-RkiddvtIbbNU9sSZwYSkCohvVGMNlkkuWl3QEbLwik/edit?usp=sharing

Programs related to food systems transformation currently running in the city

1. **Rikolto Funded Good Food for Cities Program:** 5-year programme aimed to transform urban food environments for improved consumption of healthy, sustainable and nutritious food by all citizens in Mbale and Kampala Cities. Key actors involved are the Government (Kampala City and Mbale City), development partners, private sector, NGOs, researchers, Farmers, Vendors, CBOs, Academia, Cultural institutions, Media, Traders among others.
   Link: https://www.rikolto.org/programmes/good-food-for-cities

2. **Resilient Urban Food Systems (RUFS Uganda)**: project funded by AgriFoSe2030 aimed at empowering smallholder farmers with skills on sustainable agriculture and capacity building on Soil conservation practices for urban farmers.
   Link: https://www.slu.se/en/ew-news/2022/5/agrifose2030-uganda-project/

-**Partnership with food-system related projects/Programmes**

Rikolto funded Good Food for Cities (GF4Cs) Programme

Please *Correct* mistakes, *add information and links* of key documents, in answering these questions. Then please, seek to reply the questions raised, in the tables. We can also discuss and finalise together in a short meeting proposed for the week of 6 November.

Questionnaire:

1: Presence of an active municipal Coordinating or interdepartmental government body for advisory and decision making of food policies and programmes

Give a short summary about it for Mbale

Mbale City Council plays a pivotal role in local governance, serving as the legislative body responsible for enacting laws, regulations, and policies that directly impact on the City's urban food system. Through its legislative powers, the City Council shapes the local legal framework, allocates resources for the well-being and progress of its constituents. Additionally, the Council serves as a coordinator between the community and municipal administration, facilitating public participation, voicing citizens' concerns, and contributing to the overall social and economic development of the city.

Then: Please fill the following form about the Coordinating Body or Interdepartmental Government Body.
If this information is available in a document or website, please send or provide the link.
If your city does not have it, please indicate what potential actors might be involved on it.

a) Representation in the Coordinating Body of different Sectors / Departments (within the city government: horizontal integration)	
List and number of different sectors, participating and their roles	Vendors, Schools, Transporters, City Staff, Model farmers, SACCOs (processors), PDWDs, women, youths, private sector, media, researchers, consumers, Government Agencies, Food

	Processors, CSOs, Restaurants and Hotels, Development Partners. In the urban food systems multi-stakeholder engagements in Mbale City, various actors play crucial roles. Vendors contribute to local economies by supplying diverse food products, while schools play a pivotal role in promoting nutrition education and healthy eating habits. Transporters facilitate the efficient movement of food within the city, ensuring accessibility. City staff are essential in coordinating and implementing urban food policies and initiatives. Model farmers showcase sustainable agricultural practices, influencing positive change. SACCOs (processors) enhance economic opportunities, especially for marginalized groups like PDWDs, women, and youths, by supporting food processing ventures. The private sector, media, researchers, and consumers contribute valuable insights, innovation, and demand considerations. Government agencies regulate and provide a policy framework. Food processors, restaurants, and hotels contribute to the diversity and quality of available food options. CSOs and Development partners provide support, and collaboration with all stakeholders is vital for creating a resilient and inclusive urban food system in Mbale City.
List sectors not engaged that should be involved in future	1. **Street Food Vendors:** These operate on most streets in Mbale City selling a variety of ready-to-eat food items to the local community. Vendors play a significant role in providing convenient and affordable food options to residents and visitors. Street food in Mbale City may include a diverse range of snacks, meals, roasted chicken and goat and beverages, reflecting the local culinary traditions and preferences. Street food vendors often contribute to the vibrancy of urban life, offering a quick and accessible source of sustenance for people on the go. However, the nature of street food vending can vary, and vendors may face challenges related to hygiene, safety, and regulatory compliance, which are important considerations for public health and urban planning. It is thus important to engage these vendors in the multi stakeholder platform discussions to improve the governance of the urban food system in the city. 2. **Mbale district representatives i.e. District Local Government; and Local food producers:** Most food consumed in the urban areas in the city is produced within Mbale district. Most farmers in the district use the urban markets within the city as a center for selling their food. Subsequently, the role of the district leadership and other stakeholders in the project interventions involves facilitating coordination, communication, and collaboration between the district and the city, ensuring effective implementation of initiatives to address food-related challenges and promote sustainable urban food systems.

b) Representation in the Coordinating Body integrate of other level Governments (local, national and intergovernmental levels: vertical integration)	
List and number of other levels of governments participating and their roles	National • Kampala City Council Authority (KCCA) • Ministry of Agriculture Animal Industries and Fisheries (MAAIF)
List governments/ levels not engaged that should be involved in future	N/A
c) Does the Coordinating Body coordinate actions work plans, etc. with other governments at local, national and intergovernmental level?	
List and number of other levels of governments engaged and forms of coordination	Local • Mbale City Council (MCC) • Mbale Central Market (MCC) National • Kampala City Council Authority (KCCA) • Ministry of Agriculture Animal Industries and Fisheries (MAAIF)
List governments/ levels not engaged that should be involved in future	
d) Does the Coordinating Body coordinate actions work plans, etc. with other non-governmental stakeholders (civil society groups, research, private sector)?	
List and number of other non-governmental stakeholders engaged and forms of coordination	Schools, Transporters, Savings Groups, PDWDs, women, youths, media, researchers, consumers, Food Processors, CSOs, Restaurants and Hotels, Development Partners.
List and number of other non-governmental stakeholders not engaged that should be engaged in future	
e) Your assessment of the functioning of this coordinating body: in relation to coherence of urban food policy and programme interventions and collaborates, or in the formulation and implementation of cross-sectoral urban food policies and programmes:	
Mandate/ Terms of Reference	The Good Food Council (GFC), operating independently, has a set of guidelines, "Terms of References" that provide a framework for overseeing and executing the urban food programs within the city.
Indicate the policy decision and/or law institutionalising the body and its current statute	Currently, there is no law institutionalizing the body. However, the political and technical teams of the City Council are part of the GFC. This is an opportunity to have this body institutionalized.
Indicate levels of integration in institutional budgets and programmes	The GFC passed a resolution for the City Council to implement regarding integration of the program agenda within the city budget for sustainability of the interventions. In the recent discussions, a resolution was passed by the GFC proposing that the Production Department at the City Council should propose a dedicated budget vote to the central government to facilitate the city's urban food system interventions such as the establishment of the Bukonde incubation project. Partners will thus play a role in advocating for increased resource

	allocations for urban areas while engaging in the national level budget processes.
Number and type of meetings held and agenda points discussed	Round table meetings; These will support engagements with the city leadership and at national level especially on urban food governance processes and national budget allocations (**2 meetings peer year**) coordination meetings; These will be meetings for the GFC to support the development of action plans and the implementation process. (**10 meetings per year**) Stakeholder Consultation Meetings; These will bring together diverse stakeholders, including government officials, community representatives, businesses, and NGOs, to gather input and perspectives on urban food system initiatives. (**4 meetings per year**)
Staff numbers and time dedicated	7 staff At least 4 hours per day
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.	At least 2 collaborations per year on food related interventions i.e. Joint Agriculture Annual Program Review; World Food Day with MAAIF; also, advocacy engagement in the national budget process to advocate for increased funds allocations towards urban food systems interventions (to work with Production Department at Mbale City Council)
Monitoring mechanisms, tools and reports	Feedback sessions Meeting minutes; and Activity reports from GFC and GFP
Information and outreach mechanisms and target groups	Multi stakeholder engagements Collaborations with strategic partners i.e. local NGOs, media, development partners etc Food Safety Campaigns Social media platforms and online resources i.e WhatsApp, Facebook, website articles, newsletters etc

2. Presence of an active multi-stakeholder food policy and planning structure

Give a short summary about it for Mbale

Please fill the following form about the multi-stakeholder structure.

-If your city has different platforms, please fill this form in for each platform. And

Indicate which platform you suggest AfriFOODlinks should focus on.

-If your city does not have it, please indicate what potential actors should be involved in it.

Platform, name and short description

a) Representation in the Multi-stakeholder Platform / Body of different Sectors / Departments (within the city government: horizontal integration)	
List and number of different sectors participating and their roles (also see the list in the Tool Stakeholder Mapping)	To be filled
List sectors not engaged that could be involved in future	

b) Representation in the Multi-stakeholder Platform / Body of other levels governments (local, national and intergovernmental levels: vertical integration)	
List and number of other levels of governments participating and their roles	City Staff, Government Agencies
List governments/ levels not engaged that could be involved in future	Mbale District Local Government representatives
c) Does the Multi-stakeholder Platform / Body count with participation of other non-governmental stakeholders (civil society groups, research, private sector) and representation of vulnerable groups	
List and number of non-governmental stakeholders	Schools, Transporters, Savings Groups, PDWDs, women, youths, media, researchers, consumers, Food Processors, CSOs, Restaurants and Hotels, Development Partners.
List and number of specific vulnerable groups (youth, women, migrants, low-income category consumers/producers)	Street Food Vendors
d) Your assessment of the functioning of this Multi-stakeholder Platform / Body: does it ensure coherence of urban food policy and programme interventions and collaboration in the formulation and implementation of cross-sectoral urban food policies and programmes?	
Host organisation (if applicable) - Food Rights Alliance (FRA) is in charge of the Good Food Parliament	
Mandate/ Terms of Reference	Not developed yet, but planned for 2024
Indicate the policy decision and/or law institutionalising the body and its current statute	Not available
Indicate levels of integration in institutional budgets and programmes	Currently, there is no law institutionalizing the body. However, the political and technical teams of the City Council are supporting partners to have this body institutionalized.
Number and type of meetings held and agenda points discussed (are reports public and available?)	Consultation Meetings: Sessions designed to gather input, feedback, and perspectives from stakeholders on key issues, proposals, or decisions. Review and Evaluation Meetings: Sessions to assess the progress, impact, and effectiveness of ongoing initiatives, allowing stakeholders to make informed decisions about adjustments or improvements. Stakeholders will also share innovative ideas, successful practices, and lessons learned to inspire and inform the group. Dialogues; Food Systems actors gather to collectively contribute to effective collaboration, consensus-building, knowledge and information sharing among others. Minutes and reports are available and accessible from the office of the City Council. These are submitted by Partners after implementation of every activity.
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	

3. Presence of a municipal urban food policy framework or strategy (or action plans).

Give a short summary about it for Mbale, with eventual website and lists of Strategies and/or policy frameworks.

Please fill the following form about available urban food policy framework or strategy.

If your city is only partially applying it or it is in the process of planning it, you can fill the relevant section; if your city does not have it and it is not in the process of planning it, you can present the most relevant documents existing on this sector and use this question to analyse them.

Please also do indicate the link of actions to AfriFOODlinks Programme

NAME Food Policy Framework or Strategy	
Is the urban food policy fully or partially applied?	in the context of the urban environment in Mbale City, there is no urban food policy in place.
Is there a specific budget for the urban food policy? If yes, what is the institution/department funding it?	Not yet
Is the urban food policy publicly accessible? If yes, where (published on paper, on internet, etc)?	N/A
How was the urban food policy designed (procedures, actors involved, etc.)?	N/A However, in the process of designing an urban food policy for the City we envisage that the process will be collaborative with common steps: Needs Assessment, Stakeholder Mapping, Task Force Establishment, Policy Drafting, Public and Expert Consultation, Review of Existing Policies, External Feedback, Policy Refinement, Formal Approval, Implementation Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Framework, and Public Awareness.
What are the main objectives stated?	
Which of these align to the AfriFOODlinks Project?	
What policy measures/instruments are effectively applied?	
What measuring targets and tools have been set?	
Does the policy/strategy/action plan define	

which organisation will lead and coordinate the framework to facilitate its implementation and operational planning?	
Have sources of financing been clearly identified and assigned, and a timeframe defined to implement, coordinate and monitor the policy/strategy/action plan?	

4. Presence of an inventory of local food initiatives and practices to guide development and expansion of municipal urban food policy and programmes

Give a short summary about it for Mbale, with eventual website and lists of Strategies and/or policy frameworks.

Please fill the following form about the inventory of local food initiatives. if your city does not have it and it is not in the process of planning it, you can present the most relevant documents existing on this sector and use this question to analyse them.

Is the inventory used to guide development and expansion of municipal urban food policy and programmes?	
Is a specific budget for developing and up-dating the inventory is made available by the city to local NGOs/research institutes?	
Is the inventory publicly accessible for use by any governmental or nongovernmental stakeholder?	

What other - formal and informal - forms of Governance related to Urban food or Urban food environment could you mention, which are not present in the above, like festivals, saving and loan groups, market associations, etc. …

List…

5. Presence of a mechanism for assembling and analysing urban food system data to monitor/evaluate and inform municipal policy making on urban food policies

Give a short summary about it for Mbale, with eventual website and lists of Strategies and/or policy frameworks.

Please fill the following form about the mechanism for assembling and analysing urban food system data. if your city does not have it and it is not in the process of planning it, you can present the most relevant documents existing on this sector and use this question to analyse them.

The monitoring/evaluation mechanism monitors is used to support the formulation of urban food policies? If yes how?	By systematically assessing the impact, effectiveness, and outcomes of any existing related urban food policies, identifying areas for improvement, and providing evidence-based insights that inform the development and refinement of future policies. It will involve regular data collection, analysis of key performance indicators, stakeholder feedback and a continuous feedback loop to ensure that the urban food policy aligns with their intended goals and effectively address the needs of the community.
Host, Coordinating Body of this mechanism	The Good Food Council

The monitoring/evaluation mechanism monitors is used to assess the food policy implementation progress? If yes how?	Regularly measuring and analysing the key performance indicators, tracking milestones and conducting periodic reviews to ensure alignment with policy objectives. Impact assessments will be conducted and feedback solicited from stakeholders and adjustments made to address the existing challenges and enhance effectiveness.
The monitoring/evaluation mechanism monitors is used to assess the impacts of the urban food policies? If yes how?	Tracking key indicators including changes in food security, nutrition, and sustainability, analysing data collected through surveys, stakeholder feedback, and performance metrics, and utilizing this information to inform policy adjustments, improvements, and evidence-based decision-making.
Are the data collected in a disaggregated way? If yes how?	Through considering specific categories based on demographic factors such as gender, age, location and income using surveys, interviews, observational studies.
Are the data shared with the other stakeholders? If yes with whom?	Mbale City Council; local NGOs and community

B) Stakeholder Mapping

If a stakeholder mapping has not been done yet, or require an update, please do this in the next weeks, using the attached tool (*D2.2 Optional Tool Stakeholder Mapping*).

We understand that under WP1 and WP4, a Urban Food Policy Mapping, has been undertaken. Please do share this information with us, as it is also relevant for WP2. We will discuss with you in the meeting this policy overview and further analysis. Attached a format for presenting these policies (*D2.2 Food Policy Action Canvas MUFPP tool*) for your information.

C) main Multi Actor Platform(s)

Regarding Deliverable 2.3, but also in relation to assuring you have a verification meeting with the MSP or Core team of your city, we would like you to:

Inform us on the main platform you would like to align the AfriFoodLinks project in your city, and what planning of meeting. This to: provide info on the main lead/core team members of this platform; when the next meeting of this platform is planned; and (if available), what the main agenda.

-Multi Actor Platform: Good Food Council (GFC) and Good Food Parliament (GFC)

-Next Meeting:

- *22 November, 2023*
- *January, 2024*
- *March, 2024*
- *August, 2024*
- *November, 2024*
-

-Agenda: Food Safety Handling and Mindset Change in Mbale City

Introduction

The transformative impact on Mbale's urban food system can be realized through the Good Food Council and Good Food Parliament Approaches. The establishment of these structured multi-stakeholder platforms coupled with a virtual platform on WhatsApp facilitated by FRA, highlights the

transformative impact of ongoing dialogues and accountability mechanisms in minimizing food waste and fostering awareness. These interactions not only enhance the capacity of vendors but also instigate a positive mindset change among consumers, encouraging shared responsibility in upholding food safety, hygiene standards, and dietary behaviours.

In addition, through regular sessions in the two platforms, stakeholders contribute ideas towards formulation of strategies, policies and regulations critical for addressing food governance challenges in the urban food system.

Through regular sessions and dialogues, they contribute to the formulation of policies, regulations, and strategies that address governance challenges in the urban food system. Additionally, these platforms enhance accountability, transparency, and knowledge-sharing, fostering a more effective and equitable governance framework for sustainable urban food systems.

Thus, we would like to align the AfriFOODlinks project to these platforms in Mbale City. Below is the detailed explanation about the two platforms.

1. **Good Food Council (GFC)**

Like any other council this is a smaller organ that makes decisions, plans and implements actions from the multistakeholder platforms and assesses progress and outcomes on a monthly basis. The involve the round table where members have equal powers and debate and sometimes hold each other on ascribed roles.

The GFC Council as an independent body consists of 19 representatives from Mbale City Council, Vendors, media facilitated by Rikolto and its partners. It is led by the Chairperson together with other three Executive Committee members. This Council acts as a central hub for organizing planning meetings and making decisions on how to implement actions for enhanced production and consumption of good food in the city. Generally, it provides technical guidance to implementing Partners within the City for effective realization of the program related interventions in Mbale City. For insistence, the GFC identifies food safety needs of the city and recommending the necessary corrective actions to the Multi stakeholder platforms for decision making. Key recommendations are documented from trainings of vendors and traders then forward to the Council for discussion before the submission to the Parliament. Some of the examples include the need to develop food safety bi laws, legal and regulatory frameworks to regulate consumption of unsafe food in the City.

2. **The Good Food Parliament (GFC)**

This is multi stakeholder platform that was launched in Mbale City with a membership of 70+ Food Systems Actors representing Mbale City Authority, District Local Government, Vendors, Farmers, CSOs, Schools, businessmen and women media representatives among others. This platform serves as a space for various stakeholders engage in and explore enabling conditions necessary for shaping the desired urban food system in Mbale City. It provides a forum for diverse actors to collectively explore the conditions required for shaping the desired food system in Mbale City. Through this collaborative approach, the GFP seeks to address the unique challenges faced by urban areas in ensuring food security and sustainability. This is led by the Speaker with Executives where it is represented. The GFC Parliament is dominated by reporting back to masses on the earlier agreed actions and responding to the questions of the public. All represented groups in the Good Food Council appear in the Parliament. The Parliament relays its proceedings to the public through the media. Resolutions made by this Parliament are forwarded to respective Offices at the City Council for implementation.

D) Municipality Priorities and Governance Research Issues

And finally, we like to start discussing the issues on Governance you see as important for further research for AfriFOODlinks in your city. A short list will do, but feel free to expand a little. Some of you have suggested an experiment/pilot under WP4 on Governance. Please provide details.

Priority actions related to Urban Food Systems in your city

- **Mobilize, organize, and actively engage local leadership in envisioning and shaping the City's food system:** Leaders at city level have the capacity and command the power to create change they want.
- **Develop and implement comprehensive city-level by-laws** to regulate the production and consumption of unsafe food in Mbale, ensuring the establishment of effective measures for food safety oversight and enforcement. Currently Mbale lacks a regulatory framework to govern the city's urban food system.
- **Strengthen collaboration among the City's urban food systems actors** to consolidate investments and achieve greater efficiency, effectiveness, and impact.
- **Establishment of an incubation project in Mbale City:** to create a centralized learning a knowledge sharing centre that serves as a comprehensive resource hub.
- **Establishing a Food Court:** to provide a controlled and centralized environment where diverse food vendors on streets can operate under standardized safety practices, minimising risks, promoting hygiene and efficiently managing food wastage. The Food Court will encourage food systems actors such as consumers, city leadership and partners to monitor the hygiene standards within the street designated places for improvement.

Main Governance related issues

- **Informal Food Markets** - Managing and regulating informal food markets to ensure that they meet health and safety standards while supporting the livelihoods of vendors is hard.
- **Food Waste Management -** food waste at various stages of the food supply chain, from production to consumption.
- **Food safety and hygiene -** food sold and served in markets, restaurants, and street food vendors meet safety and hygiene standards to prevent foodborne illnesses. This is partly a mindset issue among the food systems actors within the city reflected in the multi-stakeholder engagement under AfriFOODlinks held on 22nd November, 2023 at Mbale Resort Hotel. The platform was to mainly interrogate deeper about mindset vs food safety issues.
- **Urban Agriculture and Land Use -** Balancing the need for urban development with the preservation of spaces for urban agriculture, which can contribute to local food production.

Annex 5. Tunis, Tunisia

For the numbering (A-D) below, we also refer to the mail sent to you:

A) Further Detailed Overview following MUFPP Governance Action Points
Check the draft city surface scan summary of your city (see below, and the added text per point: 1-5).
This follows the MUFPP 5 key points of action on Governance.

1) **City-level committee/department/staff dedicated to Food Policy**

Currently, food policy planning is done at national level by the National food security council and the National Commission for sustainable development at Tunis city level, the proposed "Municipal food security unit" is not yet operational.

2) **Multi-stakeholder platform responsible for advisory and decision-making regarding the formulation and/or implementation of food policies and programs**

There is no Multi-stakeholder platform in Tunis City but national councils/commissions and working groups responsible for decision-making in relation of the formulation and/or implementation of food policies and programs.

3) **Food strategy**

Tunis City has no Food Strategy

4) **Recent stakeholder mapping**

A first AfriFOODlinks key stakeholder working group was formed to gather their opinion about the WP4 intervention selection during a meeting organized by Tunis city teem on 30th October 2023 in Tunis Municipality headquarter. This working group consists of 26 members from local and national government level, civil society, private sector, research (see minutes of the meeting).

5) **Recent Policy Analysis of the urban Food System**

Research studies were conducted by the INNTA and their partners (INC, Municipality of Tunis, AUB, FAO, GAIN, among others) to assess urban food system.

- FAO, GAIN and WOF. 2022. Assessment of retail food environments and green spaces for healthy cities – Methodological guidance based on the experiences in Dar es Salaam, Lima, Tunis. Rome. FAO. https://www.fao.org/documents/card/es/c/CC0191EN/
- ELBASSUONI, Shady, GHATTAS, Hala, EL ATI, Jalila, *et al.* DeepNOVA: A Deep Learning NOVA Classifier for Food Images. *IEEE Access*, 2022, vol. 10, p. 128523-128535. https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/stamp/stamp.jsp?arnumber=9975313
- AKL Christelle, 2023. School Neighbourhood Food Environments and Schoolchildren's Nutrition in Greater Tunis. https://scholarworks.aub.edu.lb/handle/10938/24187
- ELBASSUONI, Shady, GHATTAS, Hala, EL ATI, Jalila, *et al.* Capturing children food exposure using wearable cameras and deep learning. *PLOS Digital Health*, 2023, vol. 2, no 3, p. e0000211. https://journals.plos.org/digitalhealth/article?id=10.1371/journal.pdig.0000211
- GHATTAS, Hala, JAMALUDDINE, Zeina, SEMAAN, Aline, ..EL ATI Jalila, *et al.* School and community drivers of child diets in two Arab cities: The SCALE protocol and innovative tools to assess children's food environments. *Plos one*, 2022, vol. 17, no 7, p. e0264963. https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0264963

Please *Correct* mistakes, *add information and links* of key documents, in answering these questions.

Then please, seek to reply the questions raised, in the tables. We can also discuss and finalise together in a short meeting proposed for the week of 6 November 2023.

Questionnaire:

1: Presence of an active municipal Coordinating or interdepartmental government body for advisory and decision making of food policies and programmes

Give a short summary about it for Tunis
In 2022, the Municipality of Tunis has published a report on "*Modèle de gouvernance alimentaire urbain pour la commune de Tunis : Vers un modèle de gouvernance alimentaire efficace et durable*". This model proposes the establishment of a food safety unit, attached to the Municipality of Tunis and composed of a multidisciplinary team, responsible for technical and administrative aspects. The objective of this model is to set up a local governance mechanism -via a municipal food security unit- to guarantee food security and promote healthy eating and well-being of Tunis citizens. The participatory approach was used to develop this model with the support of FAO. The implementation of this model is not yet achieved.

Please fill the following form about the Coordinating Body or Interdepartmental Government Body.
If this information is available in a document or website, please send or provide the link.
If your city does not have it, please indicate what potential actors might be involved on it.
The responses to this questionnaire refer to the report on "*Modèle de gouvernance alimentaire urbain pour la commune de Tunis : Vers un modèle de gouvernance alimentaire efficace et durable*".

a) Representation in the Coordinating Body of different Sectors / Departments (within the city government: horizontal integration)		
List and number of different sectors, participating and their roles	**Sectors/Departments**	**Roles**
	· Municipalité de Tunis · Staff de "Unité de Sécurité alimentaire municipale" · Commissions de la Municipalité de Tunis (hygiène, propreté et de l'environnement, travaux et de l'aménagement de territoire, affaires sociales, espaces verts, gouvernance et de la démocratie et de la société civile).	· Pilotage politique du modèle de gouvernance. · Supervision des travaux de la structure opérationnelle et la facilitation de son travail. · Représentation de la commune de Tunis dans les réunions de planification régionale et nationale pour plaider en faveur de ses priorités stratégiques. · Reporting auprès du Conseil Municipal.
	Et les représentants de : · Direction Régionale du Commerce, Tunis · Direction Régionale de la Santé, Tunis · Direction Régionale de l'Equipement, Tunis · Direction Régional du Tourisme, Tunis	· Assurer l'approvisionnement de la production agricole dans le milieu urbain de qualité et en quantité suffisante · Assurer la sécurité alimentaire moyennant un approvisionnement stable et durable · Etablir des partenariats avec les institutions techniques et de recherche scientifique et bénéficie des études réalisées

	· Direction Régionale de l'Education, Tunis · Commissariat Régional de Développement Agriculture, Tunis	· Lutter contre le gaspillage. · Mener une campagne de changement de comportement des citoyens.
List sectors not engaged that should be involved in future	Les représentants de : · Direction Générale de la Production Agricole, Tunis · Direction Générale de l'Agriculture Biologique, Tunis · Commissariat Régional de l'Education, Tunis	
b) Representation in the Coordinating Body integrate of other level Governments (local, national and intergovernmental levels: vertical integration)		
	Sectors/Departments	**Roles**
List and number of other levels of governments participating and their roles	Les représentants de : · Ministère de l'Equipement et de l'Habitat · Ministère de l'Industries, des mines et de l'Energie · Institut National de la Consommation · Institut National de Nutrition et de Technologie Alimentaire · Agence Nationale de Contrôle Sanitaire et Environnemental des Produits · Agence Nationale de Gestion des déchets · Agence Nationale de Protection de l'Environnement · Instance National de la Sécurité Sanitaire des Produits Alimentaires · Société Tunisienne des Marchés de Gros	· Assurer l'approvisionnement de la production agricole dans le milieu urbain de qualité et en quantité suffisante · Assurer la sécurité alimentaire moyennant un approvisionnement stable et durable · Etablir des partenariats avec les institutions techniques et de recherche scientifique et bénéficie des études réalisées · Lutter contre le gaspillage. · Mener une campagne de changement de comportement des citoyens
List governments/ levels not engaged that should be involved in future	Les représentants de : · Ministère de l'Intérieur · Ministre des Finances · Ministères de l'Agriculture, des Ressources Hydrauliques et de la Pêche Maritime · Ministère de l'Equipement et de l'Habitat · Ministère du commerce et du développement des exportations · Ministère de la Santé · Ministère de l'Education · Ministère de l'Environnement · Observatoire National de l'Agriculture · Agence de Promotion de l'Industrie et de l'Innovation, Tunis · Agence de Promotion des Investissements Agricoles, Tunis	
c) Does the Coordinating Body coordinates actions work plans, etc. with other governments at local, national and intergovernmental level?		

List and number of other levels of governments engaged and forms of coordination	The municipal food security unit is non-yet operational but the municipality of Tunis is coordinating some action plans in the context of its strategic framework for the development of the city of Tunis, e.g.: **1. Reduction of urban food waste in kindergartens primary school** with: Institut National de la Consommation; Ministère de l'Education; **2. Promotion of vegetable gardens** with: Ministères de l'Agriculture, des Ressources Hydrauliques et de la Pêche Maritime ; Agence Nationale de Protection de l'Environnement ; **3. Short food circuits** with: Ministère de l'Intérieur ; Ministères de l'Agriculture, des Ressources Hydrauliques et de la Pêche Maritime ; Société Tunisienne des Marchés de Gros.
List governments/ levels not engaged that should be involved in future	1. Ministère de la femme, famille, enfance et personnes âgées ; Agence Nationale de Gestion des déchets. 2. Ministère de l'Equipement et de l'Habitat. 3. Ministère des finances ; Ministère de l'Industries, des mines et de l'Energie ; Ministère du commerce et du développement des exportations.
d) Does the Coordinating Body coordinates <u>actions</u> <u>work plans</u>, etc. with <u>other non-governmental</u> stakeholders (civil society groups, research, private sector)?	
List and number of other non-governmental stakeholders engaged and forms of coordination	Association zéro waste Office de défense des consommateurs ; 20 millions de consommateurs ; Association Maghrébine de Sécurité Sanitaire des Aliments, Association Tunisienne pour Informer le Consommateur Groupements professionnels Scouts tunisiens ; Associations des écoles de base ; Associations des parents d'élèves Union Tunisienne de l'Agriculture et de la Pêche Union Tunisienne de l'Industrie, du Commerce et de l'Artisanat FAO UN-Habitat
List and number of other non-governmental stakeholders not engaged that should be engaged in future	Permaculture Tunisie
e) Your assessment of the functioning of this coordinating body: in relation to coherence of urban food policy and programme interventions and collaborates, or in the formulation and implementation of cross-sectoral urban food policies and programmes: Not Applicable	
Mandate/ Terms of Reference	NA
Indicate the policy decision and/or law institutionalising the body and its current statute	NA
Indicate levels of integration in institutional budgets and programmes	NA

Number and type of meetings held and agenda points discussed	NA
Staff numbers and time dedicated	NA
Amount and source of budget available for the functioning of the coordination body	NA
Number and types of programmatic collaborations on food (between 2 or more departments) and other city initiatives/policies designed, implemented or planned.	NA
Monitoring mechanisms, tools and reports	NA
Information and outreach mechanisms and target groups	NA

2. Presence of an active multi-stakeholder food policy and planning structure

Give a short summary about it for Tunis

There in no active multi-stakeholder food policy and planning structures in Tunis City. But, several multi-stakeholder structures are working in food chain domain:

- le Conseil National de Protection du Consommateur;
- le Conseil National de la Sécurité Alimentaire;
- Groupes de Travail sur l'élaboration de stratégie dont l'alimentation est un axe principal. Exemple: Comité multisectoriel de la stratégie nationale de prévention et de lutte contre l'obésité et de la stratégie nationale de prévention et de contrôle des maladies non transmissibles.

Please fill the following form about the multi-stakeholder structure.
-If your city has different platforms, please fill this form in for each platform. And Indicate which platform you suggest AfriFOODLinks should focus on.
-If your city does not have it, please indicate what potential actors should be involved in it.

Conseil National de Protection du Consommateur [National Consumer Protection Council]

a) Representation in the Multi-stakeholder Platform / Body of different Sectors / Departments (within the city government: horizontal integration)	
List and number of different sectors participating and their roles	Le Ministre chargé du Commerce : Président. 33 membres : 13 représentants des ministères concernés et 5 représentants des institutions scientifiques et 15 représentants des organisations nationales.
List sectors not engaged that could be involved in future	
b) Representation in the Multi-stakeholder Platform / Body of other levels governments (local, national and intergovernmental levels: vertical integration)	
List and number of other levels of governments participating and their roles	

List governments/ levels not engaged that could be involved in future	
c) Does the Multi-stakeholder Platform / Body counts with participation of other non-governmental stakeholders (civil society groups, research, private sector) and representation of vulnerable groups	
List and number of non-governmental stakeholders	Organisation de Défense du Consommateur
List and number of specific vulnerable groups (youth, women, migrants, low-income category consumers/producers)	
d) Your assessment of the functioning of this Multi-stakeholder Platform / Body: does it ensure coherence of urban food policy and programme interventions and collaboration in the formulation and implementation of cross-sectoral urban food policies and programmes?	
Host organisation (if applicable)	
Mandate/ Terms of Reference	
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 (are reports public and available?)	
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	

3. Presence of a municipal urban food policy framework or strategy (or action plans).

Give a short summary about it for Tunis, with eventual website and lists of Strategies and/or policy frameworks.

Please fill the following form about available urban food policy framework or strategy.

If your city is only partially applying it or it is in the process of planning it, you can fill the relevant section; if your city does not have it and it is not in the process of planning it, you can present the most relevant documents existing on this sector and use this question to analyse them.

Please also do indicate the link of actions to AfriFOODLinks Programme

NAME Food Policy Framework or Strategy	
Is the urban food policy fully or partially applied?	
Is there a specific budget for the urban food policy? If yes, what is the institution/department funding it?	
Is the urban food policy publicly accessible? If yes, where (published on paper, on internet, etc)?	
How was the urban food policy designed (procedures, actors involved, etc.)?	
What are the main objectives stated?	
Which of these align to the AfriFOODLinks Project?	
What policy measures/instruments are effectively applied?	
What measuring targets and tools have been set?	
Does the policy/strategy/action plan define which organisation will lead and coordinate the framework to facilitate its implementation and operational planning?	
Have sources of financing been clearly identified and assigned, and a timeframe defined to implement, coordinate and monitor the policy/strategy/action plan?	

4. Presence of an inventory of local food initiatives and practices to guide development and expansion of municipal urban food policy and programmes

Give a short summary about it for Tunis, with eventual website and lists of Strategies and/or policy frameworks.

Please fill the following form about the inventory of local food initiatives. if your city does not have it and it is not in the process of planning it, you can present the most relevant documents existing on this sector and use this question to analyse them.

Is the inventory used to guide development and expansion of municipal urban food policy and programmes?	
Is a specific budget for developing and up-dating the inventory is made available by the city to local NGOs/research institutes?	
Is the inventory publicly accessible for use by any governmental or nongovernmental stakeholder?	

What other - formal and informal - forms of Governance related to Urban food or Urban food environment could you mention, which are not present in the above, like festivals, saving and loan groups, market associations, etc. …

List…

5. Presence of a mechanism for assembling and analysing urban food system data to monitor/evaluate and inform municipal policy making on urban food policies

Give a short summary about it for Tunis, with eventual website and lists of Strategies and/or policy frameworks.

Please fill the following form about the mechanism for assembling and analysing urban food system data. if your city does not have it and it is not in the process of planning it, you can present the most relevant documents existing on this sector and use this question to analyse them.

The monitoring/evaluation mechanism monitors is used to support the formulation of urban food policies? If yes how?	
Host, Coordinating Body of this mechanism	
The monitoring/evaluation mechanism monitors is used to assess the food policy implementation progress? If yes how?	
The monitoring/evaluation mechanism monitors is used to assess the impacts of the urban food policies? If yes how?	
Are the data collected in a disaggregated way? If yes how?	
Are the data shared with the other stakeholders? If yes with whom?	

B) Stakeholder Mapping

If a stakeholder mapping has not been done yet, or require an update, please do this in the next weeks, using the attached tool (*D2.2 Optional Tool Stakeholder Mapping*).

We understand that under WP1 and WP4, a Urban Food Policy Mapping, has been undertaken. Please do share this information with us, as it is also relevant for WP2. We will discuss with you in the meeting this policy overview and further analysis. Attached a format for presenting these policies (*D2.2 Food Policy Action Canvas MUFPP tool*) for your information.

C) main Multi Actor Platform(s)
Regarding Deliverable 2.3, but also in relation to assuring you have a verification meeting with the MSP or Core team of your city, we would like you to:

Inform us on the main platform you would like to align the AfriFoodLinks project in your city, and what planning of meeting. This to: provide info on the main lead/core team members of this platform; when the next meeting of this platform is planned; and (if available), what the main agenda.

-Multi Actor Platform: Name
-Next Meeting: date
-Agenda:

D) Municipality Priorities and Governance Research Issues
And finally, we like to start discussing the issues on Governance you see as important for further research for AfriFOODLinks in your city.
A short list will do, but feel free to expand a little.
Some of you have suggested an experiment/pilot under WP4 on Governance. Please provide details.

Priority actions related to Urban Food Systems in your city

Main Governance related issues

For discussion in our meeting…

Annex 6. Cape Town, South Africa

For the numbering (A-D) below, we also refer to the mail sent to you:

A) Further Detailed Overview following MUFPP Governance Action Points
Check the draft city surface scan summary of your city (see below, and the added text per point: 1-5). This follows the MUFPP 5 key points of action on Governance.

Questionnaire:

1: Presence of an active municipal Coordinating or interdepartmental government body for advisory and decision making of food policies and programmes

The 2019, Cape Town City Resilience Strategy, identified food security as a key focus point for the city. Together with the COVID-19 and 2018 water crises, this led to establishing of the Food Systems Programme (FSP) in 2021. The Food Systems programme is included in the City's highest level plan – the Integrated Development Plan (2022-2027). Other co-ordination is conducted on an ad-hoc basis as and when opportunities arise.

Governance structures include: (1) Food System Working Group within the Risk and Resilience Department that meets on an ad hoc basis, but as a minimum it meets quarterly; (2) Food Systems Community Practice for food researchers and academics is convened bi-annually to align and co-ordinate research projects; and lastly, a Food Indaba limited to City staff is also convened bi-annually.

The Food Systems Working group have met more than 13 times since August 2019. These interactions have had impact by enabling food systems mainstreaming into City Policies.

→ How is this coordinated, budgeted? Who leads?
How is this coordinated: This is coordinated by the custodian of the Food Systems Programme. There are three associated processes. One is the detailed regular meetings and processes via the Food Systems Working Group. The second is the Research community of Practice which comprises both government researchers and academics, but also associated researchers and students doing research related work on the food system in Cape Town. The third is an ad hoc, select body that reacts to and engages various food system challenges (detailed later).
Whilst these platforms work proactively to promote food systems outcomes, others, such as the City Business Continuity Crisis Committee and Combined Assurance Forum work to identify and manage risk; and prepare for crises. Food systems actors have recently been included in both; in addition to the Food and Beverage Growth Coalition.

How is this budgeted: There is no direct budget for this work. The coordination and leadership of the body is covered within the wider City Risk and Resilience Department's overall operating budgets. Non-City actors participate on a voluntary basis and receive no payment for participation. However, participation is reciprocated by being at the proverbial table, engaging in the debates. For many academics, this offers a space to claim policy and impact engagement.
Who leads: As per the above, this is led by the custodian of the Food Systems Programme.

→ Are there permanent participants: is there a list of main actors / Stakeholder mapping done?

Yes, there is a core group. This was informed by a stakeholder mapping that was done in as early as 2014, and continually updated and refined during the development of the Resilience Strategy drafting. This comprised two key elements, a mapping of all City and Provincial departments whose work

impacted the City food system, with a further refinement of this to detail the responsible officials whose work within those departments engaged City food system activities. A second on-going and "live" stakeholder mapping process collected details of key stakeholders but updates and refines this list on a regular basis. Currently there are an estimated 185 members of this group, with about 50 stakeholders being active members.

There is a core group of 30 that includes City and provincial officials, key NGOs and CSO and academics.

Then: Please fill the following form about the Coordinating Body or Interdepartmental Government Body.
If this information is available in a document or website, please send or provide the link.
If your city does not have it, please indicate what potential actors might be involved on it.

a) Representation in the Coordinating Body of different Sectors / Departments (within the city government: horizontal integration)	
List and number of different sectors, participating and their roles	Sectors represented include City of Cape Town Departments: Resilience, Economic Development, City Health, Spatial Planning, Research, Policy, Water and Sanitation, Housing, Transport, Strategic Planning, Social Services. Other local governments – these have been consulted as part of wider food system engagements driven by other actors but exposed to CoCT work - Cape Winelands; Mossel Bay; George Provincial Government: Department of the Premier, Environment and Spatial Planning, Agriculture, Education, Social Development, Strategic Planning, Research Units: Universities of Western Cape, Cape Town, Stellenbosch, CPUT, Isandla, GreenCape, Environmental Management Group Intermediary organisations: Economic Development Partnership, ICLEI – Africa, Southern African Food Lab, VPUU, Peninsula School Feeding Scheme; Consumer Good Association of South Africa; South African Food and Farming Trust/Food Dialogues; Sustainable Development Institute, LocalSouth, Wesgro Civic groups: Food Agency Cape Town, SA Urban Food and Farming Trust, Abalimi; LangaQuarter; DGMT;

	Sustainability Institute, SAWITA (Informal Traders) Development Donor groups: TMG, HBF, Private sector: SPAR YeboFresh Cape Town Fresh Produce Market
List sectors not engaged that should be involved in future	Most large private sector food system actors elect not to participate, but City is actively engaging to resolve this.. ~~National Government does not actively engage and often when they do, offer contrarian views and are disparaging of local government and MSPs engaging in food governance~~.
b) Representation in the Coordinating Body integrate of other level Governments (local, national and intergovernmental levels: vertical integration)	
List and number of other levels of governments participating and their roles	The City is the lowest tier of government but some local councillors participate, Also, other local governments have participated, including those detailed above. Further, Provincial government actors have participated, specifically the PGWC and Gauteng.
List governments/ levels not engaged that should be involved in future	National Government, and specifically Health, Agriculture and Social Development but involvement of NDoA is questioned as they actively object to local governments and MSPs engaging food systems governance. National is planning to create a food and nutrition coordinating council housed in the Department of the President. This needs to consider urban food security. If it does not, in a country that is 75% urbanised, the implications are deeply problematic. Urban is not part of the current draft TOR.
c) Does the Coordinating Body coordinates actions work plans, etc. with other governments at local, national and intergovernmental level?	
List and number of other levels of governments engaged and forms of coordination	As detailed above, the CoCT FSWG actively collaborated with the Provinical Government of the Western Cape, and specifically their FSWG and the Nourish to Flourish Strategy. Currently other local governments participate in the CoCT FSWG activities, but this is limited.
List governments/ levels not engaged that should be involved in future	National Government and specifically the planned National Food and Nutrition Security Co-ordinating Committee
d) Does the Coordinating Body coordinate actions work plans, etc. with other non-governmental stakeholders (civil society groups, research, private sector)?	
List and number of other non-governmental stakeholders engaged and forms of coordination	Yes. This is an active. All of the below are active participants: Research Units:

	Universities of Western Cape, Cape Town, Stellenbosch, CPUT, Isandla, GreenCape, Environmental Management Group Intermediary organisations: Economic Development Partnership, ICLEI – Africa, Southern African Food Lab, VPUU. Provincial School Feeding Civic groups: Food Agency Cape Town, SA Urban Food and Farming Trust, Abalimi; LangaQuarter; DGMT; Sustainability Institute, SAWITA (Informal Traders) Development Donor groups: TMG, HBF, Private sector is less engaged with one actor participating but very few others, this is a key limitation We classify the informal sector as private sector and while they engage, this is through representative bodies, such as SAWITA, but also through City-convened meetings with Informal Traders and the Food and Beverage Growth Coalition.
List and number of other non-governmental stakeholders not engaged that should be engaged in future	Private sector is less engaged with one retail secotr actor participating but very few others, this is a key limitation
e) Your assessment of the functioning of this coordinating body: in relation to coherence of urban food policy and programme interventions and collaborates, or in the formulation and implementation of cross-sectoral urban food policies and programmes:	
Mandate/ Terms of Reference	A clear mandate and terms of reference, but embedded within the overarching Resilience Strategy. This is also embedded within the Food Systems Programme (2021) and Implementation Plan (2022)
Indicate the policy decision and/or law institutionalising the body and its current statute	This is embedded within the Resilience Strategy and their wider mandate. However food is actively detailed in two key strategic planning documents, the integrated development plan (IDP) and the Spatial Planning Development Framework (MSDF). Both are key strategic documents and align with fiscal allocations for implementation. Through these two documents the food work is mandated and this enables the draw down of fiscal resources. The Food Systems Programme (2021) by virtue of its inclusion in te IDP and the associated council approval, can draw down and attract budgets.
Indicate levels of integration in institutional budgets and programmes	As per the above.

Number and type of meetings held and agenda points discussed	Agenda points vary and the Resilience Officer structures the meetings in accordance with specific FS needs, governance diaries (planning process), events, crises, visiting researchers, new reports, etc. Meetings are held on an ad hoc basis, but typically this amounts to every 2 months.
Staff numbers and time dedicated	Led by Resilience officer as part of wider mandates, with 1 allocated junior staff.
Amount and source of budget available for the functioning of the coordination body	Unknown and not specifically listed. This is within a wider departmental budget and guided by need and tasks allocated. Information on specific amounts will not be made public
Number and types of programmatic collaborations on food (between 2 or more departments) and other city initiatives/policies designed, implemented or planned.	At least 5, with Spatial planning on FSUP, with Economic Development on Informal Sector summit, with Strategic Policy on policy matters, with Urban Health on nutrition transition, with planning and infrastructure on food sensitive street re-design, with social development on food gardens and the associated food gardens policy.
Monitoring mechanisms, tools and reports	A set of key City Food actions are detailed in the Food Programme. Resilience Dept staff are monitored and measured against these. An Annual Food Systems Report is prepared. To date there have been 3 – 2021, 2022 and 2023. Academic partners are also expected to engage critically in food related topics and possible policies that could impact food system outcomes. This takes place in a generative and constructive manner.
Information and outreach mechanisms and target groups	This work is actioned by the partners. Given the complexities of food systems governance and engagements and the expectations place of city government to deliver on a wide range of development issues, the city plays a support rather than active championing role in terms of outreach and engagement. Outreach and information have largely been internal towards building food systems profile within the City.

2. Presence of an active multi-stakeholder food policy and planning structure

Notes from Rapid Scan/Found in Literature:

Food Systems Programme (FSP) in 2021.
The Food Systems Working group

→ What is the main MSP platform [maybe say something about an ecosystem of platforms – Food Imbizo, FSWG, Food Indaba, Food Forums (EDP). All serve different functions, no single one really the main one, unless you have another perspective?]

→ In the PPT for AfriFOODlinks planning, you identify three platforms: the annual MDP public gatherings, the Policy Window mobilisations (learning labs), and the Food System Innovator Series. Could you provide more information on the MSP platform: organized by who, main actors, participants, meeting schedule, organized by whom, notes, links websites, etc.

Overview Food Network Actors: https://www.sacities.net/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/S3-City-of-Cape-Town.pdf

And further information:

Please fill the following form about the multi-stakeholder structure.
-If your city has different platforms, please fill this form in for each platform. And indicate which platform you suggest AfriFOODLinks should focus on. MSPs have changed and adapted over the past 5 years in response the need at the time. Going forward, a useful contribution would be an assessment of the ecosystem and a gap analysis. At this time, a gap to consider is the inclusion of Capetonians more broadly.

-If your city does not have it, please indicate what potential actors should be involved in it. This would need to be determined through the gap analysis.

Platform, name and short description

a) Representation in the Multi-stakeholder Platform / Body of different Sectors / Departments (within the city government: horizontal integration)	
List and number of different sectors participating and their roles (also see the list in the Tool Stakeholder Mapping)	City of Cape Town Departments: 10 Other local governments: 4 Provincial Government: 6 Research Units: 7 Intermediary organisations: 5 Civic groups: 7 Development Donor groups: 2 Private sector: 1 (+1)
List sectors not engaged that could be involved in future	Private sector Food Manufacturing Sector Rights based organisations (Right to food, right to health, right to environment all in SA constitution) International donor bodies Other municipalities National government department
b) Representation in the Multi-stakeholder Platform / Body of other levels governments (local, national and intergovernmental levels: vertical integration)	
List and number of other levels of governments participating and their roles	Provincial and (National)1 (+1) National offers in productive top-down input and is negative towards local government's acting in the food system. The provincial Government is a key strategic partner aligned with their delivery mandates and programmatic activities, specifically health and nutrition (provincial mandates)

List governments/ levels not engaged that could be involved in future	1
c) Does the Multi-stakeholder Platform / Body counts with participation of other non-governmental stakeholders (civil society groups, research, private sector) and representation of vulnerable groups	
List and number of non-governmental stakeholders	As detailed above: 22
List and number of specific vulnerable groups (youth, women, migrants, low-income category consumers/producers)	SAWITA representing Informal traders and others via Quarterly Informal Trader meetings convened by Enterprise and Investment. Attendance typically ±30.
d) Your assessment of the functioning of this Multi-stakeholder Platform / Body: does it ensure coherence of urban food policy and programme interventions and collaboration in the formulation and implementation of cross-sectoral urban food policies and programmes?	
Host organisation (if applicable)	
Mandate/ Terms of Reference	Yes
Indicate the policy decision and/or law institutionalising the body and its current statute	Mandated through formal council approval of the Resilience Strategy and IDP, but also with food's explicit inclusion on IDP and Food Sensitive Spatial Planning actions included in MSDF and district plans. (Challenge that while FSSD might be included, implementation of such a new concept is a challenge)
Indicate levels of integration in institutional budgets and programmes	Active but a constant negotiation. Key approach of the Food Programme is to facilitate double duty actions – can a road upgrade improve health and nutrition outcomes? If so, budget need from one department but many benefit. This requires pragmatic and senior bureaucratic engagement which is a work in progress. Also works or doesn't on a case by case basis.
Number and type of meetings held and agenda points discussed (are reports public and available?)	As above internal meeting processes are not made public. However, regular meetings are held every two months. Reports are distributed to WG members but not advertised publicly. Engagements also tend to be ad hoc as the opportunities arise.
Staff numbers and time dedicated	X2 (10%)
Amount and source of budget available for the functioning of the coordination body	Undisclosed but key to the strategy is to insert food into other departmental budgets
Number and types of programmatic collaborations on food (between 2 or more departments) and other city initiatives/policies designed, implemented or planned.	At least 5.
Monitoring mechanisms, tools and reports	Assessed in relation to the implementation plan. Annual Food Systems Report prepared.
Information and outreach mechanisms and target groups	Ad Hoc and aligned to other departmental processes, for example the Informal Traders summit. This is not a food system group role but actively participated and led some of the key sessions.

3. Presence of a municipal urban food policy framework or strategy (or action plans).

Notes from Rapid Scan/Found in Literature:

In 2019, Cape Town launched the City's Resilience Strategy. This strategy identified food security as a key focus point for the city. This, together with the COVID-19 and 2018 water crises, led to establishing of the Food Systems Programme (FSP) in 2021.
The Resilience Strategy represents an important starting point for the City's food work. Due to the complexity of the food system, which is currently only loosely governed, the City recognised the need for applying a food system approach. What followed, was the development of a Food System Programme, aiming for enhanced resilience and food security. Transversal in its nature, the programme is aligned with the Sustainable Development Goals, the Milan Urban Food Policy Pact as well as C40 and ICLEI food system programmes. Its six themes include food governance, food resilience, food production, food environments, food and health, and food economy.

The Food Systems Working group have had impact by enabling food systems mainstreaming into City Policy, including inputs to the Urban Agriculture Policy, Informal Sector Support Framework, District Spatial Plans, Metropolitan Spatial Development Framework, Comprehensive Integrated Transport Plan, Informal Trading Norms and Standards and recently the Integrated Development Plan, ensuring a five-year commitment.

Cape Town: **Resilience Strategy**: (Resilient Cities Programme)
https://resource.capetown.gov.za/documentcentre/Documents/City%20strategies%2C%20plans%20and%20frameworks/Resilience_Strategy.pdf

→ Can you provide links to the different strategies.

Cape Town has already started integrating food into spatial planning and design processes. The City considered food elements in their district planning processes, especially looking at providing infrastructural support for traders at public transport interchanges, and better protecting agricultural land.
Under the overarching concept of health, food has also been integrated into the updated Metropolitan Spatial Development Framework.

And further information:

Please fill the following form about the available urban food policy framework(s) or strategy or strategies.

If your city is only partially applying it or it is in the process of planning it, you can fill the relevant section; if your city does not have it and it is not in the process of planning it, you can present the most relevant documents existing on this sector and use this question to analyse them.

Please also do indicate the link of actions to AfriFOODLinks Programme

NAME Food Policy Framework or Strategy

Is the urban food policy fully or partially applied?	Fully applied but is a living strategy so constantly updated and acted on as new possibilities, research and funding emerge. For example, a recent Bloomberg Healthy Cities project has unlocked specific opportunities, as has AfriFOODlinks.
Is there a specific budget for the urban food policy? If yes, what is the institution/department funding it?	No, part of the food strategy and the UFP is is embedded within the resilience department but operates across departments
Is the urban food policy publicly accessible? If yes, where (published on paper, on internet, etc)?	Yes: Forms part of the resilience strategy: https://resource.capetown.gov.za/documentcentre/Documents/City%20strategies%2c%20plans%20and%20frameworks/Resilience_Strategy.pdf
How was the urban food policy designed (procedures, actors involved, etc.)?	Through a detailed drafting process with an external support process but then validated through local FSWG members.
What are the main objectives stated?	Strengthen the Cape Town food system by focusing on improving access to affordable and nutritious food for Capetonians, particularly those living in vulnerable communities, using high quality data and focused interventions. The key focus areas include: Food Governance Food Resilience Food Production Food Environments Food & Health Food Economy
Which of these align to the AfriFOODLinks Project?	All but specifically Food Governance Food Resilience Food Environments Food & Health Food Economy
What policy measures/instruments are effectively applied?	All as needed but some require collaboration from other departments. The absent direct mandate for food and nutrition issues does mean that caution and collaboration is needed.
What measuring targets and tools have been set?	The implementation strategy sets out the implementation targets and it is against these that the strategy is assessed.
Does the policy/strategy/action plan define which organisation will lead and coordinate the framework to facilitate its implementation and operational planning?	Yes, the Resilience Department
Have sources of financing been clearly identified and assigned, and a timeframe defined to implement, coordinate and monitor the policy/strategy/action plan?	Yes but contingent on ongoing budgeting and resourcing processes.

4. Presence of an inventory of local food initiatives and practices to guide development and expansion of municipal urban food policy and programmes

In many neighbourhoods, self-organised Community Action Networks were established to help citizens in need. Nevertheless, the City compiled a list of civil society and community-based organisations they could support, and collaborated with the provincial government and civil society to provide food relief through community kitchens and food parcels. To identify vulnerable households, the administration repurposed a vulnerability map created during the 2017-2018 water crisis. The Philippi Horticultural Area, an agricultural zone that has a fresh produce market, was revitalised and augmented with an agri-hub through the City's Urban Catalytic Investment project, using the space as a hub for food distribution and refrigeration facilities.

→ Are/Is there such inventories, or data system. Any links or documents?

If not, see below under point B

And further information:

Please fill the following form about the inventory of local food initiatives. if your city does not have it and it is not in the process of planning it, you can present the most relevant documents existing on this sector and use this question to analyse them.

Is the inventory used to guide development and expansion of municipal urban food policy and programmes?	Yes, a City Action Summary Document is updated on an ongoing process and forms the basis for the annual Food Systems Report. It requires collaboration across multiple departments. This is also a key document that enables action in times of risk as vulnerable areas are targeted through the inventory or partners.
Is a specific budget for developing and up-dating the inventory made available by the city to local NGOs/research institutes?	This sits within the wider urban governance structure. Information is gathered by managed through the City data teams and access is types of data are enabled through engagements with the data actors.
Is the inventory publicly accessible for use by any governmental or nongovernmental stakeholder?	This is city specific but there are layers that can be accessed on request.

What other - formal and informal - forms of Governance related to Urban food or Urban food environment could you mention, which are not present in the above, like festivals, saving and loan groups, market associations, etc. …

Various different events specific to different sectors, such as the informal economy, but also health engagements. The food programme group actively align with and where possible support these events. [Primarily through the Food Dialogues.]

5. Presence of a mechanism for assembling and analysing urban food system data to monitor/evaluate and inform municipal policy making on urban food policies

→ Is there such a mechanism, or how is this undertaken?
Yes, but this is embedded within wide city data gathering and engagement processes
→ Relevant links to documents on Cape Town food system analysis and data.

Please fill the following form about the mechanism for assembling and analysing urban food system data. if your city does not have it and it is not in the process of planning it, you can present the most relevant documents existing on this sector and use this question to analyse them.

The monitoring/evaluation mechanism monitors is used to support the formulation of urban food policies? If yes how?	An annual Food Systems report reports progress and trends. It informs the Implementation Programme. Ad hoc processes are initiated as needed in response to a particular crisis to determine risk and intervention.
Host, Coordinating Body of this mechanism	Risk and Resilience Department
The monitoring/evaluation mechanism monitors is used to assess the food policy implementation progress? If yes how?	The preparation of the annual Report includes a City survey of activities to monitor progress against objectives. Budgets are included in this process. The document is however not public.
The monitoring/evaluation mechanism monitors is used to assess the impacts of the urban food policies? If yes how?	Yes. There are however difficulties in monitoring impact when project metrics do not include food/nutrition outcomes.
Are the data collected in a disaggregated way? If yes how?	Yes and different data are combined to enable a detailed fine grain representation of data.
Are the data shared with the other stakeholders? If yes with whom?	In a managed manner. A challenge is that some of the data cannot be shared as a result of specific protective and data management laws and protocols.

B) Stakeholder Mapping
If a stakeholder mapping has not been done yet, or require an update, please do this in the next weeks, using the attached tool (*D2.2 Optional Tool Stakeholder Mapping*).

We understand that under WP1 and WP4, a Urban Food Policy Mapping, has been undertaken. Please do share this information with us, as it is also relevant for WP2. – This will be sent in a separate attachment
We will discuss with you in the meeting this policy overview and further analysis.
Attached a format for presenting these policies (*D2.2 Food Policy Action Canvas MUFPP tool*) for your information.

C) main Multi Actor Platform(s)
Regarding Deliverable 2.3, but also in relation to assuring you have a verification meeting with the MSP or Core team of your city, we would like you to:

Inform us on the main platform you would like to align the AfriFoodLinks project in your city, and what planning of meeting. This to: provide info on the main lead/core team members of this platform; when the next meeting of this platform is planned; and (if available), what the main agenda.

-Multi Actor Platform: Name
-Next Meeting: date
-Agenda:

D) Municipality Priorities and Governance Research Issues
And finally, we like to start discussing the issues on Governance you see as important for further research for AfriFOODLinks in your city.
A short list will do, but feel free to expand a little.
Some of you have suggested an experiment/pilot under WP4 on Governance. Please provide details.

Priority actions related to Urban Food Systems in your city

Main Governance related issues

For discussion in our meeting…