

REPORT: GENDER AND THE MILAN URBAN FOOD POLICY PACT MONITORING FRAMEWORK INDICATORS

February 2019

RUAF Foundation, the International Water Management Institute, & the CGIAR
Research Program on Water, Land and Ecosystems

Author: Laine Young
Laurier Centre for Sustainable Food Systems



TABLE OF CONTENTS

REPORT: GENDER AND THE MILAN URBAN FOOD POLICY PACT MONITORING FRAMEWORK INDICATORS.....	1
INTRODUCTION	3
BACKGROUND.....	3
THE IMPORTANCE OF GENDER.....	4
EXAMPLES OF GENDER POSITIVE STRATEGIES	5
IMPORTANCE OF DATA DISAGGREGATION BY GENDER	6
THE INDICATORS	7
CONCLUSION	13
REFERENCES	14

INTRODUCTION

Globally, we are at a critical tipping point to make the necessary sustainable changes to promote a healthier future. The EAT Lancet Commission (2019) explains that “food is the single strongest lever to optimise human health and environmental sustainability on Earth” (p. 5). They call for an urgent, radical food system transformation. Food in urban areas has the potential to make cities more sustainable places. The Milan Urban Food Policy Pact (MUFPP) is one way that cities are working towards sustainable food system change at the local level. The pact was signed by more than 100 cities on October 15, 2015 in Milan, Italy. It has brought multiple cities together with diverse experiences to help each other solve the problems associated with rapid urbanization and the resulting issues with ensuring the right to food to urban residents. To assess progress within the signatory cities, a monitoring framework with indicators and targets was developed by 13 of those cities and a group of FAO-RUAF experts. This monitoring framework covers the six areas of the MUFPP and includes 42 indicators, some of which are qualitative and some quantitative. This framework aligns with the Sustainable Development Goals, to assist cities to integrate the work being done within global networks they are a part of (MUFPP, 2019).

This report was developed by Laine Young, Laurier Center for Sustainable Food systems and RUAF partner this work was implemented in the context and with support of IWMI CGIAR WLE RUAF collaboration.

BACKGROUND

At first glance, the MUFPP monitoring framework is robust and inclusive of many significant indicators of a city striving to ensure the sustainability of food in their communities. However, through a more critical reading, it is apparent that the indicators and targets unintentionally homogenize the experience of urban residents. The framework lacks reflection on the diverse representation within cities that could enrich it with fuller, more equitable data. Additionally, if the targets are inclusive of different experiences, the city has the potential to not only ensure the right to food for its citizens, but to work towards a more equitable city overall. Municipal government is the political sphere closest to people and are responsible for ensuring the rights of the citizens. The Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM), recognizes that women are underrepresented in municipal governments and that local government is the best position for involvement in decision making concerning their lives (FCM, 2009). Communities are not homogeneous and citizens’ needs, opportunities, and access to resources differ, making it challenging for local governments to make their limited resources stretch (Joseph, 2002).

The MUFPP was signed by cities in both the global South and North. Each signatory city has different economic, social and political situations which this monitoring framework has taken into account. As they stand, the indicators and targets have the capacity to be integrated into each signatory city, with little adjustment. To take the monitoring framework further and to get a clearer picture of the situation in each city, it is important to undertake some analysis on how differences between urban residents might affect their ability to participate in the urban food system. These differences could be economic or social and might be represented by intersections of gender, race, ethnicity, class, ability or sexuality.

This report will highlight how to include one of these intersectional experiences, gender, into the monitoring framework through indicators, targets and a disaggregation of data. Gender equality is one of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) that cities are striving to achieve through partnership in global networks like the MUFPP. Gender equality looks like “equal visibility, empowerment and participation of both women and men in all spheres of public and private life, and aims to promote the full participation of women and men in society” (FBiH, 2015, p. 5). Women’s experiences of the urban environment are often unequal. For example, they are disproportionately affected by climate change and disasters, often because of their roles and unequal social norms (UNDP, 2019). Because women are most often responsible for meeting household food, water and energy needs, when these are interrupted by effects of climate change or other disasters, they hold the burden of responsibility (UNDP, 2019). Another example is in Bangladesh, where cultural barriers leave women and girls at the most risk for adverse effects of disaster. When monsoon season flooding occurs, women and girls are often unable to leave their homes, or they are unable to swim (UN Women, 2017). However, focusing on gender does not include only women, as men can face inequalities in other areas such as, educational attainment, dropout rates, criminal activities, violence, employment, and lack of control in reproduction (Näslund-Hadley, Urban & Mannheim, 2007). In adding gender dimensions to this assessment, it should show where certain inequity is present within a city and give further information on how to improve the situation for all urban residents.

It is important to note that because this report is only addressing gendered dimensions, it will not tell the whole story. In fact, it is not enough for indicators to be disaggregated by gender, as certain groups of people face multiple forms of discrimination and oppression (FBiH, 2015). It is important for cities to take this example as a starting point and determine how to integrate other intersections of difference that their residents might experience. The more information cities have, the better informed they will be in ensuring the right to food of their most vulnerable residents.

THE IMPORTANCE OF GENDER

Gender sensitivity is an awareness of issues relating to gender and ensuring these issues are considered in decision-making and policy/program development (Joseph, 2002). Integrating a gender perspective into municipal processes can ensure policies and programs are working towards equity. Joseph (2002) explains that a gendered perspective ensures gendered analysis within city structures and explores the relationship between genders, the structuring of society along gendered lines, and the impact of these both on society. She iterates that a gender analysis addresses the complex needs of a community, separating people’s experiences and access to resources and power. Gender sensitivity, perspectives and analysis are key elements of democratic governance and are necessary to development (FBiH, 2015).

To institutionalize gender equality across municipal sectors, gendered perspectives should be incorporated into all local planning processes (Näslund-Hadley et al., 2007). Municipal governments can benefit from this mainstreaming of gender institutionally as it allows for more efficient means of administering resources, contributes to the elimination of discrimination, ensures that all genders are able to participate and benefit from municipal programs, and allows for better monitoring and evaluation

(Näslund-Hadley et al. 2007). Gender sensitive monitoring and evaluation reflect the situations of all genders to allow for comparison, instead of focusing solely on women. Having gender specific data available and using appropriate indicators can assist municipalities in making and evaluating goals on gender equality (Näslund-Hadley et al., 2007). In addition to being just, focusing on gender equality at the municipal level can increase productivity and drive economic growth (FCM, 2014). The European Commission states that there is evidence that shows great economic benefits that result from having a better balance of gender at the table during economic decision-making (FCM, 2014).

EXAMPLES OF GENDER POSITIVE STRATEGIES

Country or Municipality	Strategies
Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina (FBiH)	Bosnia and Herzegovina have been adopting Gender Action Plans since 2006 that includes a gender perspective in programs and policies and the development of programs to empower women at all levels of government (FBiH, 2015). Women’s empowerment “involves practical measures to enhance women’s participation in decision-making and in governance processes” (UN-Habitat, 2008, p. 8). They consider it an obligation to collect data that is disaggregated by gender and highlight that it is the basis for analysing gender equality and require local governments to establish institutional mechanisms for gender equality.
Rwanda	Post-genocide, Rwanda’s work on gender equality was a major focus. The country has the highest number of women in parliament (UN-Habitat, 2008). This is a unique situation as the country was left with 60% of the population as women after the genocide, leading to women becoming the leaders in repairing their country (UN-Habitat, 2008). Rwanda promotes women to participate at all levels of government and has introduced policies to guarantee their seats at the table.
Ottawa, Canada	The City of Ottawa adopted an Equity and Diversity policy in 2002 that committed the City to work on gender equality issues (City of Ottawa,

	2008). They focus is on key gender quality concerns such as, family responsibilities, unpaid work, importance of social services, income, poverty, time use and mobility, safety, discrimination, unheard perspectives, and limited access to decision making.
Ukraine	The Ukraine has made commitments to ensuring gender equality by including gender equality provisions in its constitution and passing a related law in 2005 (FCM, 2014).
Manitoba, Canada	In 1994, in Manitoba, Canada, the Women’s Enterprise Centre of Manitoba (WECM) was established to assist women to start, operate & grow their own businesses. They provide 1-on-1 business advising, business training & financing up to \$150,000. (FCM, 2013)

IMPORTANCE OF DATA DISAGGREGATION BY GENDER

Different genders experience the city in distinctive ways because of spatial and organizational aspects, institutional barriers, information barriers, (UN-Habitat, 2008), as well as differing power relations. To best address the needs of all genders, disaggregated data at the city level is necessary for policy, planning and program development (UN-Habitat, 2008). This data allows for a fuller picture (City of Ottawa, 2008).

As highlighted by the example in Bosnia and Herzegovina, gender data disaggregation is critical, and it would be impossible to complete a gendered analysis without it. Not only does this data provide important statistical information, it provides local governments the information they need to improve. Assumptions do not assist in improving gender equality, a quality analysis of the situation is needed (FBIH, 2015). The Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina (2015) iterates that “data broken down by gender affiliation is one of the essential preconditions for qualitative and quantitative analysis of the state of gender equality at the local level” (p. 25). They explain that in order for municipalities to fulfil this task, the municipal council or Mayor must mandate the obligation that all information collected by the public sector be disaggregated by gender. This is the basis for quality local governance. This type of analysis will show instances of discrimination, inequality in rights access, and the differences in resource access between genders as well as show the path forward to social change and how to intervene (FBIH, 2015).

THE INDICATORS

Workstream	Action	Indicator	Potential Gender Data Disaggregation
Ensuring an enabling environment for effective action (governance)	1. Facilitate collaboration across city agencies and departments and seek alignment of policies and programmes that impact the food system across multiple sectors and administrative levels.	1 - Presence of an active municipal interdepartmental government body of advisory and decision making of food policies and programs	<i>Disaggregate by % of each gender within municipal government body participants</i>
	2. Enhance stakeholder participation at the city level through political dialogue, as well as through education and awareness raising.	2 - Presence of active multi-stakeholder food policy and planning structure	<i>Disaggregate by % of each gender within stakeholders</i>
	3. Develop or revise urban food policies and plans	3 - Presence of a municipal urban food policy or action plan	<i>Determine whether urban food policy includes gender sensitive policies within</i>
	4. Identify, map and evaluate local initiatives	4 - Presence of an inventory of local food initiatives and practices to guide development and expansion of municipal urban food policy and programmes	<i>Disaggregate by % of each gender of who leads these initiatives and practices</i>
	5. Develop or improve multisectoral information systems for policy development and accountability	5 - Presence of a monitoring/evaluation mechanism for assembling and analysing urban food system data to inform municipal policy making on urban food policies	N/A
	6. Develop a disaster risk reduction	6 - Experience of a food supply emergency / food	<i>Determine whether gendered vulnerability is included in the</i>

	strategy to enhance the resilience of urban food systems	resilience management plan for the municipality (in resp. to disasters; vulnerabilities in food production, transport, access; socio economic shocks, etc.) based on vulnerability assessment	<i>emergency / food resilience plan.</i>
Sustainable diets and nutrition	7. Promote sustainable and healthy diets	7 – Minimum dietary diversity for women of reproductive age	<i>Disaggregate by % of each gender for dietary diversity</i>
		8 – Number of households living in “food deserts”	<i>Disaggregate by % of each gender of head of household living within “food deserts”</i>
		9 – Costs of a nutritious food basket at city/community level	<i>N/A</i>
		10 – Individual average daily consumption of meat	<i>Disaggregate by % of each gender of individual consumption of meat</i>
	8. Address non-communicable diseases associated with poor diets and obesity	11 – Numbers of adults with type 2 diabetes	<i>Disaggregate by % of each gender of adults with type 2 diabetes</i>
		12 – Prevalence of stunting for children under five years	<i>Disaggregate by % of each gender of prevalence of stunting for children under 5 as well as the gender of their head of household</i>
		13 – Prevalence of overweight or obesity among adults, youth and children	<i>Disaggregate by % of each gender of adults, youth and children with overweight or obesity</i>
	9. Develop sustainable dietary guidelines	14 – Number of city-led or supported activities to promote sustainable diets	<i>N/A</i>
	10. Explore regulatory and voluntary instruments to	15 – Existence of policies / programmes that address sugar, salt and fat	<i>N/A</i>

	<p>promote sustainable diets</p> <p>11. Encourage joint action by health and food sectors</p>	<p>consumption in relation to specific target groups</p>	
	<p>12. Adapt standards and regulations to make sustainable diets accessible in public and private sector facilities</p>	<p>16 – Presence of programmes/policies that promote the availability of nutritious and diversified foods in public facilities</p>	<p>N/A</p>
	<p>13. Adapt standard and regulations to make safe drinking water accessible in public and private sector facilities</p> <p>14. Invest in and commit to achieving universal access to safe drinking water and adequate sanitation</p>	<p>17 – Percentage of population with access to safe drinking water and adequate sanitation</p>	<p><i>Disaggregate by % of each gender with access to safe drinking water and adequate sanitation</i></p>
<p>Social and economic equity</p>	<p>15. Use case and food transfers and other forms of social protection systems</p>	<p>18 – Percentage of food insecure households based on the Food Insecurity Experience scale (FIES)</p>	<p><i>Disaggregate by % of each gender of head of household considered food insecure by the FIES scale</i></p>
		<p>19 – Percentage of people supported by food and/or social assistance programs</p>	<p><i>Disaggregate by % of each gender of individual or head of household supported by food and/or social assistance programs</i></p>
	<p>16. Reorient school feeding programmes and other institutional food service</p>	<p>20 – Percentage of children and youth (under 18 years) benefitting from school feeding programmes.</p>	<p><i>Disaggregate by % of each gender of children and youth benefitting from school food programs.</i></p>
	<p>17. Promote decent employment for all</p> <p>18. Encourage and support social and</p>	<p>21 – Number of formal jobs related to the urban food system that pay at least the</p>	<p><i>Disaggregate the % of the population with formal jobs that earn at least the</i></p>

	solidarity economy activities	national minimum or living wage	<i>minimum or living wage, by gender.</i>
	19. Promote networks and support grassroots activities	22 – Number of community-based food assets in the city	N/A
		23 – Presence of food-related policies and targets with a specific focus on socially vulnerable groups	<i>Disaggregate by % of each gender of food-related policies and targets. Women as a potential vulnerable group.</i>
	20. Promote participatory education, training and research in strengthening local food system action	24 – Number of (types of) opportunities for food-related learning and skill development in i) food and nutrition literacy, ii) employment training and iii) leadership	<i>Disaggregate by % of each gender of people receiving this skill development. Exploration of if opportunities for food-related learning and skill development are inaccessible by gender.</i>
Food production	21. Promote and strengthen urban and peri-urban food production and processing	25 – Number of city residents within the municipal boundary with access to an (urban) agriculture garden	<i>Disaggregate % data of women-led gardens.</i>
		26 – Presence of municipal policies and regulation that allow and promote agriculture production and processing within the municipal area	<i>Determine whether these policies and regulations are gender-sensitive.</i>
	22. Protect and enable secure access and tenure to land for sustainable food production in urban and peri-urban areas 23. Apply an ecosystem approach to guide holistic and integrated land use planning management	27 – Surface area of (potential) agricultural spaces within the municipal boundary	N/A

		28 – Proportion of total agricultural population – within the municipal boundaries- with ownership or secure rights over agricultural land for food production by gender	<i>Disaggregate % data of gendered land ownership and access.</i>
		29 – Proportion of agricultural land in the municipal area under sustainable agriculture	N/A
	24. Help provide services to food producers in and around cities	30 – Number of food producers that benefited from technical training and assistance in the past 12 months	<i>Disaggregate % data by gender of those who benefitted from technical training and assistance.</i>
	25. Seek coherence between the city and nearby rural food production, processing and distribution 26. Support short food chains, producer organizations, producer-to-consumer networks and platforms	31 – Number of municipal food processing and distribution infrastructures available to food producers in the municipal area	<i>Disaggregate the % of accessibility by gender to local food processing and distribution infrastructures available to food producers in municipal area.</i>
		32 – Proportion of local / regional food producers that sell their products to public markets in the city	<i>Disaggregate the % of accessibility by gender of food producers in municipal area that sell products to markets in the city</i>
	27. Improve (waste) water management and reuse in agriculture and food production	33 - Annual proportion of urban organic waste collected that is re-used in agriculture production taking place within municipal boundaries.	N/A

Food supply and distribution	28. Assess the flows of food to and through cities.	34. Existence of policies /programmes that address the reduction of GHG emissions in different parts of the food supply chain (e.g. processing, storage, transport, packaging, retail, cooking, waste disposal etc.)	N/A
	29. Support improved food storage, processing, transport and distribution technologies and infrastructure linking peri-urban and near rural areas.	35 - Presence of a development plan to strengthen resilience and efficiency of local food supply chains logistics	N/A
	30. Provide policy and programme support for municipal public food markets 31. Improve and expand support for infrastructure related to food market systems	36 - Number of fresh fruit and vegetable outlets per 1000 inhabitants (markets and shops) supported by the municipality. 37 - Annual municipal investment in food markets or retail outlets providing fresh food to city residents, as a proportion of total (investment) budget	N/A
	32. Review public procurement and trade policy aimed at facilitating food supply from short chains.	38 - Proportion of food procurement expenditure by public institutions on food from sustainable, ethical sources and shorter (local/regional) supply chains	N/A
	33. Assess, review and/or strengthen food control systems	39 - Presence of food safety legislation and implementation and enforcement procedures 40 - Existence of support services for the informal	N/A

		food sector providing business planning, finance, development advice.	
Food Waste	34. Convene food system actors to assess and monitor food loss and waste reduction	41 - Total annual volume of food losses and waste	<i>Determine whether there is representation by gender, ethnicity and class of food system actors</i>
		42 – Annual number of events and campaigns aimed at decreasing food loss and waste	N/A
	36. Collaborate with the private sector along with research, educational and community-based organizations	43 – Presence of policies or regulations that address food waste prevention, recovery and redistribution	<i>Determine whether there is representation by gender, ethnicity and class within stakeholders.</i>
	37. Save food by facilitating recovery and redistribution for human consumption	44 – Total annual volume or surplus food recovered and re-distributed for direct human consumption	N/A

CONCLUSION

Approximately half of the global population identify as women. Cities have a responsibility to ensure that gender equality is present in data aggregation, decision-making, and policy development. While many cities have enacted gender-based laws in the last 20 years, there is still much work to be done. The MUFPP monitoring framework is an excellent example of the necessity of disaggregated data by gender and other relevant social categories. To ensure the right to food within municipalities and eliminate barriers, analysis is needed that looks at the experiences of all of the citizens.

REFERENCES

- City of Ottawa (2008). Gender equality lens: Promoting equality and inclusion for the full diversity of women in the city of Ottawa. City of Ottawa: City for All Women Initiative. Retrieved from: <http://www.cawi-ivtf.org/gender-equality-lens>
- EAT-Lancet Commission (2019). Summary report: Healthy diets from sustainable food systems. Retrieved from: <https://eatforum.org/eat-lancet-commission/eat-lancet-commission-summary-report/>
- FCM (2009). Promoting women's leadership in local government: Local government associations help women meet the challenge. Federation of Canadian Municipalities. Retrieved from: https://data.fcm.ca/documents/case-studies/International/Promoting_womens_leadership_in_local_government_Local_government_associations_help_women_meet_the_challenge_EN.pdf
- FCM (2013). Case study: Is there a need to support women entrepreneurs. Federation of Canadian Municipalities. Retrieved from: http://americalatinagenera.org/newsite/images/Estudio_sobre_el_emprendimiento_de_las_mujeres_por_Alison_Kirkland_ENG.pdf
- FCM (2014). Gender equality issues in local economic development: Policy brief insights from Ukraine. Federation of Canadian Municipalities. Retrieved from: <http://www.cib-uclg.org/cib-library/content/gender-equality-issues-local-economic-development>
- FBiH (2015). Manual for gender equality at the local level. Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Retrieved from: <https://www.osce.org/bih/216636?download=true>
- Joseph, C. (2002). Gender and local government. Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, South Africa. Retrieved from: <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.461.1909&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- MUFPP (2019). Monitoring framework. Milan Urban Food Policy Pact. Retrieved from: <http://www.milanurbanfoodpolicypact.org/monitoring-framework/>
- Näslund-Hadley, E., Urban, A., & Mannheim, C.P. (2007). Technical notes on gender equality in municipal development: Experiences from Latin America and the Caribbean. Inter-American Development Bank Gender and Diversity Unit. Retrieved from: <https://publications.iadb.org/en/publication/11723/technical-notes-gender-equality-municipal-development-experiences-latin-america>
- UNDP (2019). Gender, climate and disaster resilience. United Nations Development Programme. Retrieved from: <https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/gender-equality/gender--climate-and-disaster-resilience.html>
- UN-HABITAT (2008). Gender mainstreaming in local authorities: Best practices. United Nations Human Settlements Programme. Retrieved from: <https://unhabitat.org/books/gender-mainstreaming-in-local-authorities-best-practices/>
- UN Women (2017). Editorial spotlight: What does gender have to do with reducing and addressing risk? United Nations Women. Retrieved from:

<http://www.unwomen.org/en/news/stories/2017/5/compilation-women-in-disaster-risk-reduction>