

Adaptation of the City-Region Food Systems Assessment Methodology (CRFS) and its planning process, developed by RUAF and FAO, for Urban Futures

Table of Contents

1 Introduction	2
1.1 General	2
1.2 Outline and timing	3
2 Methodology by phase	4
2.1 Rapid Scan	4
2.1.1 Introduction	4
2.1.2 Establishing the local context of the city (jurisdictional, demographic, socioeconomic, geographical and environmental)	5
2.1.3 Characterizing the food system, including climate risk and resilience	8
2.1.3 Reflection/analysis and reporting	16
2.2 ToC workshop, indicator development and preparation for In-depth Assessment	17
2.2.1 Introduction	17
2.2.2 TOC workshop	18
2.2.3 Developing indicator framework	20
2.2.4 Preparing for the In-depth Assessment	22
2.3 In-depth Assessment	25
2.3.1 Reflection/analysis	26
2.4 City strategy	26

1 Introduction

1.1 General

The purpose of the Urban Futures (UF) Assessment is to provide information on the current state and workings of the food system in each of the 10 UF cities, with a particular focus on young people & gender. It will build on the City Selection process, and the information obtained during the assessment will be used as a basis for action planning, and may provide a baseline for future assessment against indicators.

The UF Assessment methodology is adapted from the City Region Food Systems Assessment (CRFS) and Planning Process, developed by RUAF and FAO. For more information, including definitions of key terms, see [Building sustainable and resilient city region food systems](#). The modifications have been made:

- 1) to accommodate the UF focus on young people & gender;
- 2) to be in line with the long-term outcomes and pathways of change in the Urban Futures Theory of Change (ToC):
- 3) to fit a shorter time frame and the activities planned during the UF inception phase (in particular the local multistakeholder ToC workshops).

In addition, users of this document may access a number of tools, examples and templates that were developed for the CRFS online toolkit (not yet published by FAO, some not yet proofread), indicated in this document in **red and numbered**. The tools are provided as separate documents; unless an external link is given they can be found in the [Google Drive](#) and [Next Cloud](#):



PLEASE NOTE

Before embarking on the Urban Futures Assessment, it will be important for the Regional teams to have i) determined the boundaries of project (food system) area for each city; ii) undertaken initial food system stakeholder mapping analysis for each city. Some cities (see later in this document) will have embarked on this process already, and this has been acknowledged in the City Selection Process.

A **Checklist will be prepared by the GT**, and discussions held with the Regional teams, before starting the Assessment. Please also review the 'Define the CRFS' section of the Handbook [Building sustainable and resilient city region food systems](#) and check to what extent these two activities have been done during the city selection process. This will be discussed with the project team (including the selected consultant), based on the checklist and the detailed guidance in the Handbook and accompanying online toolkit.

Determining boundaries: The spatial/territorial boundaries of the city or city region must be determined so that the project team can establish:

- the relevant geographical area for collation or collection of territorial data and indicators;
- the area for which actions will be designed, and in which they will be implemented.

1. Examples: Defining the CRFS boundaries

Stakeholder mapping analysis: Both direct food system stakeholders (food supply chain actors) and indirect stakeholders with a focus on youth (e.g. municipal, metropolitan and provincial departments, NGOs, community-based organizations, universities/research institutes, and support organizations dealing with food and related areas) need to be identified at the start of the project.

This goes beyond identification of potential project partners. Key stakeholders will need to be actively engaged in multistakeholder platforms, where they will contribute to visioning, priority setting, (possibly) food systems assessment/ action planning, implementation, and monitoring. Additional stakeholders can be mapped during the assessment (see Rapid Scan). Again, some cities may have embarked on this already. In addition, stakeholder assessment will be an ongoing process, and support key activities (ToC, City Strategy, MSPs, etc.).

2. Template: Stakeholder interview guide and profile sheet

3. Template: Table for collating stakeholder data

4. Template: Table for ensuring representation in stakeholder interviews

1.2 Outline and timing

It is suggested to carry out the assessment in three phases:

- 1) Rapid Scan (5 – 6 weeks)
- 2) ToC workshop, indicator development and preparation for In-depth Assessment (2 weeks)
- 3) In-depth Assessment (4 – 5 weeks)

The assessment will be followed by Action Planning. Although action planning falls outside of the consultancy brief to develop an assessment methodology, workshop activities and working groups are outlined. This concerns Urban Futures Action Planning. Some cities may have Food/Youth related Action Planning (Strategy, Ambitions, an active MSP, etc.), to which UF actions need to be aligned. Information and examples of former Hivos and RUAF projects will be shared separately (UF Nextcloud).

These phases broadly fit around the activities planned during the UF inception phase (up to end of the year 2023, tbd.) – in particular the ToC workshops to validate, localise and elaborate the ToC and strategic planning. Given the planning differences and differences in available information between the regions, it is required that the Regional Coordinators fine tune the methodology to their work plans and schedules.

Summary of Urban Futures Assessment outputs

By the end of the assessment the project team will have:

- A written report of assessment with sections on the Rapid Scan (local context of the city, broad characterization of the food system, including what is already known about climate risk and resilience, with a particular focus on young people) and on the initial priority areas covered in the In-depth Assessment. A list of priority areas for action.

- An indicator framework.
- A visual dashboard of the findings, based on a suggested template.
- A list of enduring data gaps, some of which will have an explanation, for which they have not been able to collect primary data – but which will nonetheless be helpful for any future work in the city.

2 Methodology by phase

2.1 Rapid Scan

2.1.1 Introduction

Purpose: The purpose of the Rapid Scan is to start building a general picture of the food system – its context, character, functioning, and climate risks and resilience – to inform the localisation of the Theory of Change and to enable identification of areas where more in-depth information is needed to inform action planning.

Data collection: The Rapid Scan is based entirely on existing (secondary) data and stakeholder knowledge, including the results of existing or recent assessments (such as the CRFS studies of Kitwe, Quito, Medellin and Cali, and recent studies undertaken in Bandung, Chongwe and Bulawayo, all available) and existing policies and programmes relating to the food system of the city / city region. Data collection is through document analysis and expert interviews, including some additional institutional stakeholder mapping if required.

Activities: There are three activities under the Rapid Scan:

- A) Establishing the local context of the city region (jurisdictional, demographic, socioeconomic, geographical and environmental), in general and with a particular focus on the situation of young people & gender.
- B) Characterizing the food system, including climate risk and resilience, and assessing the functioning of the food system (including narratives), in general and with particular focus on the impacts on and role of young people.
- C) Reflection/analysis and reporting.

Timing: It is suggested to spend a total of 5 – 6 weeks on the Rapid Scan (3 – 4 weeks for gathering information/data and at least 2 weeks for reflection and reporting). The amount of time needed will depend on how much information has already been gathered under the city selection process, as well as the lead researcher's knowledge and access to previous studies in the city. Remember that it should be rapid and aimed at gathering enough existing information to inform the TOC workshop and early action planning. It is important to set a timeline at the outset, to draw up explicitly defined tasks, and to identify individuals responsible for getting the work done (based on information available after the city selection process, as well as with the food systems consultant).

Data (dis)aggregation: Data that has been collected only at the national level must be disaggregated to the city level (as far as possible); or to the level of the administrative region or several municipalities that are included in the city region. Likewise, data that has been collected at the level of individual city districts must be aggregated at city level. If such aggregation is not possible (e.g. if datasets cover areas that are only partly within the city boundaries), data boundaries should be clearly identified.

Data gaps: Data should be as recent as possible. It is highly unlikely that all the information needed will be available from secondary sources. There will be some gaps where data is not available. This may be for several reasons, e.g.:

- data has not been collected;
- data is collected but is inaccessible/controlled by certain actors or entities;
- data is collected at the national or regional level and cannot be usefully disaggregated.

Data gaps that relate to the initial priority areas may be filled through the collection of primary data during the In-depth Assessment.

The Rapid Scan should, nonetheless, be sufficient to inform localisation of the ToC in the planned workshop.

2.1.2 Establishing the local context of the city (jurisdictional, demographic, socioeconomic, geographical and environmental)

Table 1 sets out jurisdictional, demographic, socioeconomic, geographical and environmental contextual factors on which data/information is to be obtained, with some (non-exhaustive) ideas of data sources.

The sources available will differ from city to city/city region, and can come from different sources. To enable a potential repeat exercise or monitoring of certain issues, it will be helpful for the regional teams to create an updated list of locally available literature and data sources (such as an expanded version of the spreadsheet for the city selection), with retrieval locations of data sources. Hard and soft copies should be collected for further use.

5. Example: Data sources for literature review in Toronto

NB Some of the information required for establishing the local context may already have been sourced for the city selection process. This information is indicated by * in Table 1, or (*) where the information may have been included in the answers to broadly-worded questions).

Table 1: Contextual factors

Jurisdictional information	Potential data sources
*Jurisdictional boundaries of and within the city; the region/province in which the city is located; neighbouring municipalities within the region.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Local government documentation and website ● Existing jurisdictional maps ● Urban planning documents / strategy
Current surface areas of the above jurisdictional areas; urban growth patterns/predictions	
Government entities and jurisdictional structures within the city and region	

Local government electoral cycles	
Demographic information	
*Population <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - across city - by district/neighbourhood 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Census data ● Household survey data
Population density: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - whole city - by district/neighbourhood 	
Young people (age range to be specified) as proportion of total inhabitants in urban areas	
Gender, race/ethnicity, religion, disability, geographical distribution of young people across city (districts/neighbourhoods)	
Socio-economic information	
*City economic profile: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Main industries / outputs - Proportion of workforce by industry, including food sector and by formal/informal (if such a study has been done) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Local economic reports
*Employment statistics: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - overall; - for each socio-economic group; - among young people. 	
Main socio-economic groups (e.g. by household income level, ethnicity / migration status, other relevant poverty/development indicators)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Census data ● Local economic reports ● Household survey data
Distribution of socio-economic groups across areas of the city	
Average household income (in local currency) for each socio-economic group	
Percentage of young people in each socio-economic group	
*Education levels: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - overall; - for each socio-economic group; - among young people. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Census data ● Household survey data
Food (in)security levels: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - overall; - for each socio-economic group; - among young people. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Household survey data ● National food experience scales/ FAO Food Insecurity Experience Scale (disaggregated to city or regional level) ● Domestic food price indices ● Public health reports (government or NGO)
Prevalence of diet-related diseases, including obesity and malnutrition-related conditions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - overall; 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - for each socio-economic group; - among young people. 	
Geographical and environmental	
<p>*Biophysical features (e.g. mountains, rivers, national parks, etc)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Planning department, development plans ● Maps (collect GPS information/maps, and start collecting georeferenced maps).
<p>Urban landscape and existence and distribution of infrastructure, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - residential areas; - slums/informal settlements; - industrial areas; - parks and green spaces; - roads; - railway stations; - public transport network; - schools and other places frequented by youth. 	
<p>Natural resources and climate data, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - existence, quality and use of watersheds (rivers and aquifers); - interannual variability of rainfall, rivers, streams; - average annual temperatures (including changes over recent years and predictions) - biodiversity; - soil type and quality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● National meteorological and hydrological services (on natural resources and climate, disaggregated) ● Environmental organisations
<p>Natural resource management (water quality, soil quality, biodiversity)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● City environment department ● Environmental organisations
<p>Known threats or vulnerabilities affecting the area, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - climate shocks and stresses that have affected the city and its vicinity in the past (e.g. last 5, 10, 15, 20 years), and their immediate physical impacts - volcano/fault lines; - disease epidemics, political instability, conflicts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Environmental organisations ● NGOs ● Media reports

▪ 2.1.3 Characterizing the food system, including climate risk and resilience

Characterizing the food system means gaining an understanding of its general functioning and performance, as well as its resilience and longer-term sustainability. This information allows the project team to start identifying the strengths, weaknesses, problems and bottlenecks within the urban or city region food system, which can inform the local ToC.

The following methodological guidance includes a scan of climate-related risks – that is, the hazards that are most likely to affect the city, the potential impacts on the urban food system, and the vulnerability, and resilience capacities of food systems assets, infrastructure, stakeholders and ecosystems – with a particular focus on impacts on young people/certain groups of youth (including gender issues). This information, which will contribute to the local ToC, may be collected at the same time, and from some of the same sources, as information for the characterisation and general functioning of the food system.

Since it is highly unlikely that all the information needed for the characterisation and climate risk assessment will be available from secondary sources, this activity also allows the project team to identify data gaps that need to be filled through collection of primary data during the in-depth assessment (see In-depth Assessment).

Important terms and context related to climate risk and resilience

A **climate hazard** is a **shock** caused by an acute event (e.g. hurricane, flooding, extreme temperatures) or a chronic **stress** over a longer period of time (e.g. gradual temperature increase, rising sea levels, salinisation, etc)

Impacts are the actual consequences or outcomes of a shock or stress on people, livelihoods, assets, infrastructure, and ecosystems.

Vulnerabilities are conditions or factors (social, economic, environmental) that make people or things more susceptible to harm from the shock or stress that has occurred. Those conditions or factors may be improved/changed so that the susceptibility to harm is reduced.

Resilience is the ability of individuals, households, communities, cities, institutions, systems and societies to *prevent, anticipate, absorb, adapt and transform* positively, efficiently and effectively when faced with a wide range of risks, while maintaining an acceptable level of functioning without comprising long-term prospects for sustainable development, peace and security, human rights and well-being for all¹.

- Preventative: to take measures to reduce existing known and future disaster risks and vulnerabilities, e.g. adopting good practices to reduce current and future risks
- Anticipatory: to be warned and acting early, e.g. the existence of and access to effective early warning systems, and being able to act upon them.
- Absorptive: to be able to cope during and after an event, e.g. having risk insurance and social protection; having mutually supportive community/business networks;

- Adaptative: to make initial change to be able to continue functioning (these changes may inform longer term transformation)
- Transformative: to do things differently and change the system, e.g. finding alternative activities or perspectives, diversifying livelihoods.

United Nations. 2020. United Nations Common Guidance on Helping Build Resilient Societies. New York, United Nations. <https://unsdg.un.org/sites/default/files/2021-09/UN-Resilience-Guidance-Final-Sept.pdf>.

-
- *Research questions*

Table 2 sets out initial research questions relating to each of the food supply chain nodes, plus additional questions on natural resource management and governance and policy frameworks.

Questions related to risks to the urban food system from climate shocks and stresses are in purple.

NB Some of the information required for characterising the food system may already have been sourced for the city selection process. This information is indicated by * in Table 1, or (*) where the information may have been included in the answers to broadly-worded questions. It will be important to review this information with the project team (including the food systems consultant).

Table 2: Initial research questions for characterising the food system

Production
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● What are the main food commodities produced in the vicinity of the city? What quantities? ● What narratives inform a) choice of food crops, and b) production methods on the vicinity of the city? What other factors (e.g. policies, environment, market demand, extension provision, etc)? ● Where are the main production areas? ● What is the proportion/distribution of farms of different sizes, production systems, and market focus (including the existence of cooperatives?), and forms of land ownership? ● Is urban agriculture practised? What forms and at what scale? (e.g. community gardens or individual households; for subsistence, exchange, or commercialisation; sack gardening, rooftop, greenhouse, hydroponic/aquaponic, etc)? ● What is the average age of commercial farmers in and around the city? What proportion of farmers/urban growers are young people? ● What proportion of commercial farmers in and around the city are women? ● What proportion of young people participate in urban agriculture at the household or community level? ● What narratives influence i) young people's ii) women's consideration of farming as a career? (e.g. perception of farming, perceived ability to make a living, strenuous nature of job, etc). ● (*) What other factors influence i) young people's ii) women's consideration of farming as a career? (e.g. access to land, training and support services, access to funds, etc) ● What are the food prices for different food crops (past, current, expected trends)? ● How has food production been impacted by climate shocks and stresses in recent years? ● Which agricultural products or staple foods have been mostly impacted?

- In what ways are young people / certain groups of young people / and women vulnerable to the above impacts?
- What resilience capacities do young people / certain groups of young people / women have to the above impacts (Preventative, anticipatory, absorptive, adaptive and transformative)?

Processing and manufacture

- What kinds of food processors and manufacturers exist in and around the city? For what foods/commodities? What type and size? What proportion are youth-led enterprises? What proportion are women-led?
- What narratives influence i) young people's ii) women's consideration of food processing and manufacture as a career? (e.g. perception of food sector work, perceived ability to make a living, strenuous nature of job, etc).
- (*)What other factors influence i) young people's ii) women's consideration of food processing and manufacture as a career? (e.g. training and education, knowledge of opportunities, access to technologies etc).
- What new innovations in processing and manufacturing have been developed or adopted by stakeholders in the city (if any)?
- Has food processing and manufacturing been impacted by climate shocks and stresses in recent years? (directly or knock-on impacts)
- Which foods or food products have been mostly impacted?
- In what ways are young people / certain groups of young people vulnerable to the above impacts?
- What resilience capacities do young people / certain groups of young people have to the above impacts (Preventative, anticipatory, absorptive, adaptive and transformative)?

Storage and distribution

- What kinds of off-farm food storage facilities exist in and around the city? For what foods/commodities? What type and size? Where are they located? What proportion are youth-led? What proportion are women-led?
- (*)What are the principal distribution channels for the main commodities produced in and around the city (e.g. middle-men who collect from farms; producer cooperatives; etc)? What areas do they cover? What proportion are youth-led?
- What are the main transportation methods and routes for food distribution between food supply chain nodes in and around the city (e.g. road network, public transport, etc)?
- What narratives influence i) young people's and ii) women's consideration of food storage and distribution as a career? (e.g. (e.g. perception of food sector work, perceived ability to make a living, strenuous nature of job, etc).
- What other factors influence i) young people's and ii) women's consideration of food storage and distribution as a career? (e.g. awareness of opportunities, training, access to space and technologies, access to funds)
- Has food storage and distribution been impacted by climate shocks and stresses in recent years? (directly or knock-on impacts)
- Which foods or food products have been mostly impacted?

- In what ways are young people / certain groups of young people vulnerable to the above impacts?
- What resilience capacities do young people / certain groups of young people have to the above impacts (Preventative, anticipatory, absorptive, adaptive and transformative)?

Wholesale, catering and retail

- What are the main outlet-types where young people obtain food / where food is obtained on behalf of young people, e.g. by parents (per population and income group, per area)? (e.g. supermarkets, small shops, markets and street traders, caterers, online food delivery platforms, and including the informal sector where information is available).
- Do the above outlets provide affordable, nutritious, safe and sustainable food?
- What narratives and other factors (e.g. availability, price, etc) inform the kinds of foods provided by the above outlets?
- What proportion of the above outlets are youth-led? What proportion are women-led?
- What narratives influence i) young people's and ii) women's consideration of food wholesale, retail or catering as a career? (e.g. perception of food sector work, perceived ability to make a living, strenuous nature of job, etc).
- What public food facilities and mechanisms are in place to serve young people? (e.g. school meals, public canteens, voucher schemes, etc.)? Which socio-economic groups are they intended for?
- Have wholesale, catering and retail been impacted by climate shocks and stresses in recent years? (directly or knock-on impacts)
- Which foods or food products have been mostly impacted?
- In what ways are young people / certain groups of young people vulnerable to the above impacts?
- What resilience capacities do young people / certain groups of young people have to the above impacts (Preventative, anticipatory, absorptive, adaptive and transformative)?

Consumption

- What are the main food commodities consumed in the city? What quantities?
- *What proportion of food consumed in the city is produced in or around the city? What types/foodstuffs?
- Where does other food that is consumed in the city come from? (by food item, origin of import (national, regional, global))
- What is the typical diet of young people in the city? Main staple foodstuffs? (per population and income group, per area)
- What narratives inform the typical diet of young people in the city? What or who shapes these narratives? How do young people encounter these narratives within their food environment?
- What other factors inform the diet of young people (e.g. affordability, access, safety)? Are there gender dimensions to these factors?
- What factors inform or affect the diet of women (e.g. cultural expectations, distribution of food within households, gender-based violence)?
- (*) What is the composition of a typical food basket? (per population and income group, per area);
- What is the price or proportion of household income spent on the above typical food basket?
- *What public food facilities or mechanisms exist for young people / families? (e.g. school meals, public canteens, voucher schemes, etc.)? What groups or areas do they target?

- What proportion of eligible young people / families use the public food facility or mechanisms to which they are entitled
- Has food consumption been impacted by climate shocks and stresses in recent years?
- Which foods or food products have been mostly impacted?
- In what ways are young people / certain groups of young people vulnerable to the above impacts?
- What resilience capacities do young people / certain groups of young people have to the above impacts (Preventative, anticipatory, absorptive, adaptive and transformative)?

Food and organic waste

- Where and how much food loss and waste is generated along the food chain in and around the city?
- What factors affect levels of food loss and waste (e.g. narratives, (lack of) infrastructure, (fluctuating) demand)?
- What is the impact of food loss and waste throughout food supply and value chains in and around the city (e.g. lost revenue, etc.)?
- Where can food loss and waste along the food supply chain be reduced (production to consumption)?
- How is organic food waste managed?
- How could organic waste be better managed? (e.g. through closed loop systems, mechanisms (platforms, apps, etc.; organisations for distribution of surplus perishable foods at lower cost/for free to vulnerable people; collaborations between producers and processors; repackaging of food intended for hospitality industry for sale in retail; measures to encourage citizens to waste as little food as possible, etc.)
- Are plastic packaging and other non-compostable food-related waste being reduced/minimised/reused/recycled?
- Are there active efforts underway to do any of these? What proportion of efforts are youth-led? What proportion are women-led?
- What narratives influence i) young people's and ii) women's consideration of food waste management as a career? (e.g. (e.g. perception of work as dirty, perceived ability to make a living, strenuous nature of job, etc).
- What other factors influence i) young people's and ii) women's consideration of food storage and distribution as a career? (e.g. awareness of opportunities, training, access to space and technologies, access to funds, access to waste sites)
- Have wholesale, catering and retail been impacted by climate shocks and stresses in recent years? (directly or knock-on impacts)
- Which foods or food products have been mostly impacted?
- In what ways are young people / certain groups of young people vulnerable to the above impacts?
- What resilience capacities do young people / certain groups of young people have to the above impacts (Preventative, anticipatory, absorptive, adaptive and transformative)?

Natural resource outlook

- What are the main issues concerning natural resources required by the urban food system?

- What factors affect water quality in and around the city? How severe are they? Is the situation worsening/improving?
- What factors affect soil quality? How severe are they? Is the situation worsening/improving?
- What factors affect the state of biodiversity and existing ecosystems in and around the city? How severe are they? Is the situation worsening/improving?
- How are natural resources impacted by climate shocks and stresses? How might they be impacted in the future?
- Are young people in the city aware of natural resource issues? What are the main narratives around natural resources?
- How can natural resource management be enhanced to contribute to improving the resilience of the food system?

Governance and policy framework of the food system

- What are the main food-related roles, powers and responsibilities at the local/regional government(s) level? How do higher levels shape these?
- What roles, powers, responsibilities do local/regional decision-makers and stakeholders have to manage multiple risks and increase resilience of the urban food system to climate-related hazards?
- Which government departments have a role related to food? What is their role?
- *What policies, programmes and initiatives exist and are actively implemented to influence the character and functioning of the food system, to increase sustainability, resilience, food safety, and equity? Are they gender sensitive? (Consider policies, programmes and initiatives at city, regional, national levels.)
- What policies, programmes and initiatives exist and are actively implemented to support i) young people, ii) women?
- Is there a local legal and institutional framework to enhance food and nutritional security?
- *Do local/regional government(s) have multi-risk emergency preparedness and contingency plans and disaster risk reduction strategies in place that include the food system?
- Are there institutionalised and functioning multi-risk monitoring and early warning systems in place that are helping to absorb impacts on the food system?
- Do(es) local/regional government(s) have a functional emergency response system?
- Do policies/programmes exist that promote good practices for vulnerability and risk reduction and climate adaptation in the food system? Are they being implemented?
- Do(es) local/regional government(s) have social protection mechanisms that could reduce vulnerability of the most vulnerable and/or improve emergency response and recovery? Are there other non-government/private mechanisms in use?
- Are there existing local/regional/national government programmes or initiatives that offer opportunities and incentives for i) young people and ii) women to pursue a career at any food system nodes? (e.g. access to land for food growing; training/extension services; value-addition).

- Are there existing local/regional/national government programmes or initiatives that support green entrepreneurs at any food system nodes? (e.g. networking, incubation, finance, digital and other services).
- (*)Is there an institutionalised fund or budget allocation for interventions focusing on building sustainable and resilient agriculture and food systems?
- Is there a food council or other governance mechanism within the city that has a role in promoting/implementing food system change? Are young people included and able to actively participate? What proportion of participants are women, and are they able to participate in a meaningful way?
- *Are there existing neighbourhood and/or community networks that work on sustainable food and/or community resilience issues? Are young people involved and able to actively participate?
- *Is there an existing youth movement in the city that is, or may be, concerned with food-related issues? What are the organisations, groups and networks? What proportion of youth (food) movement members are women? What proportion of youth (food) movement groups and organisations are led by women?
- *Is there an existing women's movement in the city that is, or may be, concerned with food-related issues? What are the organisations, groups and networks? What proportion of women's (food) movement members are youth? What proportion of women's (food) movement groups and organisations are led by youth?
(NB These questions will have been addressed in stakeholder mapping if done)
- *Is there an existing climate activism movement in the city that is, or may be, concerned with food-related issues? What are the organisations, groups and networks? What proportion of members are young people and women?
(NB These questions will have been addressed in stakeholder mapping if done)
- *Is there a multi-stakeholder platform for citizens to co-create the city's agenda, alongside local government and other stakeholders? Are young people and women included and able to actively participate in any such platform?
(NB These questions will have been addressed in stakeholder mapping if done)
- *Is there a space for young people and youth organisations to discuss, analyse, strategize and re-imagining their city, including environmental and natural resource issues and urban resilience?
- *Are there media outlets that would be interested in reporting on food, youth, and gender issues in the city? What are they?
- *How are educational establishments in the city managed (schools, colleges, universities)? Is there already, or is there potential for, engagement over food issues?

- *Data collection*

- Document analysis (data courses, surveys, studies)

In the first instance, desk research is carried out to draw relevant information from existing data sources, surveys and studies. The project team may not be able to find exactly the right data to

answer the questions, but it is acceptable to make a few estimations based on the data that are available. Possible documentary data sources for characterising the food system include (but are not limited to):

- National and international databases (e.g. FAOSTAT on food production, trade, values; Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES) on food insecurity; International Labour Organization (ILO) stats on labour markets).
- Local government website, policy documents, plans and budgets (as well as those of agencies, and contractors) for, for example, farm census data, retail centre studies, food waste data, economic reports, agricultural reports.
- Chambers of commerce and unions (e.g. food business register).
- NGOs and aid agencies (e.g. household consumption and nutrition reports).
- Specialist organisations and networks (e.g. urban and peri-urban agriculture).
- Universities (e.g. land maps and data, consumption and retail outlet studies, policy analyses).
- UN sites and World Bank indicators

Possible additional documentary data sources for climate risk and resilience are:

- Media reports
- Previous studies on urban resilience (e.g. 100 Resilient Cities)
- Documents on other projects and studies on climate and resilience
- National meteorological and hydrological services (natural resources and climate, disaggregated)
- Data from environmental organisations and health institutions (on water quality, pollution)

To answer questions on governance and policy frameworks, desk research also includes existing policies, strategies and plans at national, regional, local, municipal levels for relevant clauses on or related to food and nutrition that (could) impact the urban food system. For example:

- Agriculture policies.
- Planning, development and land use strategies.
- Public health policies.
- Economic development strategies.
- Food security action plans.
- Public procurement policies.
- Risk management plans and strategies.
- Disaster risk reduction, climate mitigation, natural resource management plans and policies.

○ Expert interviews

The project team may also be able to fill some data gaps through expert interviews with, for example, academics, agricultural experts and value chain experts, risk management professionals, local government officials and NGOs. At this stage the team does **not** interview or collect primary data through any other means from local stakeholders/actors such as individual farmers, processors or other food system stakeholders (including young people).

Potential expert interviewees may be identified from previously conducted stakeholder mapping analysis (either during the Rapid Scan or before), and any additional institutional stakeholder mapping analysis (see below). Interviews must be semi-structured so that more details can be

sought on interesting emerging information, with open-ended questions grouped according to themes. The experts may also provide supporting documentation that has not been published (if they have the authority or authorization to do so).

6. Example: In-depth interview guide

Any data gaps that persist after conducting both document analysis and expert interviews are noted, and their causes determined if possible.

o Institutional stakeholder mapping analysis

As noted above, it is expected that a stakeholder mapping has been carried out by the project team in advance of the assessment. An additional round may be helpful as part of the Rapid Scan, focusing specifically on institutional actors from government departments and agencies and their mandates. This can contribute to answering the questions on governance and policy frameworks. Tools and methodologies are available in the CRFS handbook, and in several Hivos and RUAF publications.

Institutional stakeholder mapping can be done by:

- listing government departments and agencies, and identifying relevant individuals with a role related to the food system, disaster risk management and urban resilience.
- carrying out an initial characterization using a table with columns for the department or agency, location, role, responsibilities, collaborators, and contact details.
- if necessary, inviting for one-to-one interviews to find out about their mandates, needs and concerns, existing policies, opinions, connections and co-operations, capacity and resources, and to obtain more information to answer the research questions.

2.1.3 Reflection/analysis and reporting

A narrative report of the rapid scan findings will be produced, including all the information/data that has been collected on both the local context and on the character of the food system, including climate risk and resilience (the report will be extended later with the addition of findings from the In-depth Assessment).

7. Template: Rapid scan report (NB this is the CRFS template)

8. Example: Synthesis report: Assessment and Planning of the Utrecht City Region Food System [ca1116en.pdf \(fao.org\)](#)

9. Example: Synthesis report: Assessment and Planning of the Medellin City Region Food System [ca5747es.pdf \(fao.org\)](#)

In addition to this straightforward reporting of information, it will be necessary to reflect on the findings and perform some light analysis to identify the strengths, weaknesses, problems and bottlenecks, as well as vulnerabilities to climate-related impacts and resilience capacities.

Ideally, this reflection and analysis is carried out collectively by the lead researcher (local partner/local consultant/regional RUAF consultant) with local technical consultants and the Regional Coordinator, so that they can decide together on the most relevant and concerning findings, as well as data gaps to be filled.

One way of doing this is to prepare several large pieces of paper on which the following headings are written:

- Strengths
- weaknesses
- problems and bottlenecks
- vulnerabilities
- resilience capacities

The local project team then assigns information drawn from the answers to the research questions under each heading. By using post-it notes (or an on-line collaboration app such as Miro), they will be able to re-order the information by importance or seriousness, and its relevance to the global Urban Futures ToC.

They will also be able to identify the most important information and data gaps, for which primary data may be collected during the In-Depth Assessment.

The outcomes of this collective reflection/analysis will be presented in the 'discussion' section of the Rapid Scan report.

2.2 ToC workshop, indicator development and preparation for In-depth Assessment

2.2.1 Introduction

ToC workshop (Based on the Hivos manual: [here](#)) may take place after the Rapid Scan (the length of the Rapid Scan will depend on availability of information, different per city). These workshops will be an opportunity to:

- Take stock of the findings of the Rapid Scan
- Highlight and align to other existing initiatives and programmes related to Urban Futures
- Conduct participatory visioning to adapt the overall UF vision to the local context and identify local priorities (based on a combination of the vision and the Rapid Scan findings). Ideally this should involve a multi-stakeholder group (either an existing, or newly formed for this initiative) that is broadly representative of those identified during the stakeholder mapping analysis.
- Adapt the global UF ToC to the local context.
- Start thinking about actions (actions to be developed under Urban Futures after the In-depth Assessment with local partners.
- Develop the Assumptions and risk assessment for the ToC.

Indicator framework: The initial priority areas are used to draw up the indicator framework, using an outcomes-based approach. The indicator framework is linked to the global TOC but also will include city specific indicators. The indicator framework may be drafted by the project team but ideally it will be shared with and validated by the wider pool of stakeholders. RUAF & UF DMEL are working in an initial set of general indicators, to be adapted by cities.

Developing methodology: The indicator framework can also be used to further identify quantitative and qualitative research questions for the In-depth Assessment, as well as relevant data collection methods. It will also be necessary to prepare data collection instruments (questionnaires, interview guides, focus group questions, etc), and to start identifying study participants.

Timing: Following the TOC workshop, it is suggested to spend at least 2 weeks drawing up the indicator framework and developing the methodology and data collection instruments for the In-depth Assessment.

2.2.2 TOC workshop

It is understood that the ToC workshop is planned as a **two-day event**. But, it is suggested to include a session (one extra day) on food systems and the relationship with the Urban Futures Program, as the event will involve relevant key food system stakeholders, including local government officials, local civic society organizations (CSOs), and local community leaders.

The workshop may consist of training sessions, discussions, and workshops. The training sessions and group discussions will provide the necessary background knowledge for the ToC development workshop and will occur **before the workshop**. This includes an introduction to the food system, the relationship with the UF Program, and an introduction to the Theory of Change.

In addition to the training, the consultant/local partner will facilitate focused group discussions and activities to support participants in developing the ToC.

- Make sure that the workshop is well-facilitated. The facilitator should be able to keep the discussion on track and ensure that everyone has a chance to participate.
- Use visual aids to help participants understand the theory of change. This could include things like diagrams, charts, or mind maps.
- Be flexible and willing to make changes to the agenda as needed. The workshop should be a collaborative process, so be prepared to adapt to the needs of the participants.
- End the workshop with a clear plan for the In-Depth assessment and possible follow-up meetings. This will help ensure that the theory of change is implemented and that progress is made toward achieving the desired outcomes.

It is suggested that the first day should be a larger multi-stakeholder workshop to present and discuss the findings of the Rapid Scan, conduct participatory visioning, and identify local priorities from the perspective of different stakeholders from across the food system.

Even though there is already a global UF vision (UF general ToC), at the local level, the visioning process helps build consensus within the project team, partners, and stakeholders regarding the project goal of their city. It brings together various perspectives and provides a more holistic or rounded picture of a better future. It also begins to capture ideas for action and a sense of priorities.

Having a summary vision statement helps to:

- anchor the project, providing a shared reference point that can help to guide discussion (for example, it can be used as a reminder of focus in reports or presentations)
- orientate any new stakeholders who join later in the process (for example, in stakeholder invitations or briefings)

It is recommended to spend a minimum of 2-3 hours on participatory visioning.

10. Tool: Developing a vision and summary vision statement

It is suggested that the second day be devoted to the localisation of the UF ToC. The three long-term outcomes of the global TOC are mandatory:

- Inclusive youth-friendly urban food policies and strategies are developed and implemented, and decision-makers are held to account;
- New narratives on inclusion and climate-resilient cities inspire behavior change and improve consumption patterns;
- Increased public and private funding flows to inclusive climate-resilient food systems.

The following agenda is a proposal based on the methodology. Still, it can (and should) be adapted for each city/region:

Draft agenda

Welcome and introductions.

- Icebreaker activity to help participants get to know each other.
- Overview of the workshop agenda and objectives

Overview of the Urban Futures program and the theory of change global methodology

- Presentation on the Urban Futures program, including its goals, objectives, and approach.
- Explanation of the theory of change process and methodology

Review of the findings of the city rapid scan

- Presentation of the findings of the city rapid scan, including key challenges and opportunities
- Discussion of the implications of the findings for the Urban Futures program

Participatory visioning for the city's future

- Facilitated discussion to develop a shared vision for the city's future.
- Identification of key priorities and goals for the city

Discussion of the current state of food systems

- Identify the main issues of the food system in the city (consider the rapid scan)
 - Prioritize main issues of the food system (plenary)
 - Problem tree analysis of the food system (group exercise)
 - Identify the contexts of the main issues of the food system (group exercise)

Identification of the desired future state of food systems (review the visioning and connection with the regional TOC)

- Brainstorming session to identify the key priorities and challenges for the city in achieving its vision.
- Prioritization of the identified priorities and challenges

Conduct participatory visioning and identify local priorities from the perspective of different stakeholders from across the food system.

- Long-term vision for the city
- Intermediate outcome
- Strategies for achieving the goals

- Assumptions and risks about how change will happen

Participants divide into small groups to develop a draft theory of change for the Urban Futures program

Review and refinement of the draft theory of change

- Participants come together as a large group to review and refine the draft theory of change
- The facilitator leads a discussion to ensure that the theory of change is clear, logical, and achievable
- Develop the activities: the activities should be aligned with the intermediate outcomes. This means the activities should be designed to help achieve the intermediate outcomes, ultimately leading to the desired outcome.

Discussion of assumptions and risks

- Participants discuss the assumptions and risks associated with the theory of change
- The facilitator leads a discussion to develop a mitigation strategy for addressing the risks

Development of a mitigation strategy based on the risk matrix (if possible)

- Participants work together to develop a mitigation strategy for addressing the risks identified in the previous step
- The mitigation strategy should include specific actions that will be taken to reduce the likelihood and impact of the risks

Identification of next steps and key actions

- Participants identify the next steps that need to be taken to implement the Urban Futures program
- The facilitator leads a discussion to develop a plan for key actions, including timelines and responsibilities

Develop the Assumptions and risk assessment for the ToC

- Participants work together to develop a list of assumptions and risks associated with the theory of change
- The facilitator leads a discussion to assess the likelihood and impact of each risk
- The group develops a mitigation strategy for each risk

Develop a theory of change diagram: This will help you to visualize the logical sequence of events that will lead to the desired outcome.

This is just a suggested agenda, and the specific activities can be tailored to the city's and the participants' needs. It is important to ensure that the workshop is inclusive and participatory, and that all stakeholders have a voice in the development of the theory of change.

Methodologies and Ideas

Problem tree analysis: This is a valuable tool for identifying the root causes of a problem. It can help participants understand the current state of food systems and identify the challenges that need to be addressed.

Intermediate outcomes and activities: These steps must be taken to achieve the desired future state. They should be specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound.

Theory of change diagram: This visual represents the theory of change. It can be used to help participants understand the logical sequence of events that will lead to the desired outcome.

2.2.3 Developing indicator framework

Following the localisation of the TOC, it will be necessary to develop a localized indicator framework.

What is an indicator framework?

An indicator framework is a table that identifies:

- The intermediary outcomes (pathways of change from the ToC), i.e., types of changes that stakeholders in the UF project want to see in the future
- Issue to be measured (in relation to each outcome)
- Possible indicators, i.e. specific, measurable characteristics relating to each issue to be measured, that can be used to show change or progress towards the outcome. Each outcome must have at least one issue to be measured, but it may have several; each issue to be measured may have one or several indicators (ideally no more than three to avoid data collection being too challenging).

Table 3: Model indicator framework

Intermediary outcome (pathway of change)	Output (key measurable change)	Possible indicator (How the change will be measured)
<p>Describes a state or position</p> <p>[Break down of the overarching aim into specific outcomes or changes that we want to put in place in order to achieve the overarching outcome/aim]</p> <p><i>E.g. Stronger entrepreneurial ecosystem provides networking, incubation, finance, digital and other services.</i></p>	<p>Describes specifically what will be assessed or measured.</p> <p>[Clarifies the focus of the assessment; the indicators will relate to this focus]</p> <p><i>E.g. Support received by young entrepreneurs to start and run successful food processing businesses</i></p>	<p>'A measure of progress towards delivery of an outcome, that is, a change in a relevant and measurable parameter.'</p> <p><i>E.g. (An increase in) the number of young people receiving training to start food processing businesses.</i></p>

Why are indicators needed?

Indicators play a multifunctional role. They allow the project team to:

- Develop research questions and appropriate data collection methods to assess the current performance of the urban food system, following a whole-systems approach.
- Further refine priority areas for action with clearly defined outcomes, issues to be measured, and ways of measuring change.
- Help with planning strategy and actions to achieve the desired outcomes.
- Enable the establishment of baselines concerning each priority area.
- Provide an evidence base to support engagement and outreach, mobilisation of resources, and communication of experiences and lessons learned.
- Allow for monitoring of changes (progress or regression) resulting from (future) policy and program implementation (although such monitoring itself falls outside the timeline of this project).

In addition, identifying, developing, or fine-tuning indicators helps focus stakeholders' minds on realizing the shared vision.

How to develop an indicator framework

An indicator [framework was developed at the global level](#), based on the global TOC and adhering where possible to the Milan Urban Food Policy Pact (MUFPP) Indicator Framework. Where the local ToC uses the same pathways of change / intermediary outcomes as the global ToC (including those that are mandatory), it is requested that the same indicators are used at the local level.

Where the local teams have adapted the pathways of change / intermediary outcomes or introduced new, locally specific ones, it will be necessary to develop a customised indicator framework.

If not, they will need to devise their own, working from left to right across the table's columns. For each intermediary outcome, they will consider the issues to be measured within the local context, then possible indicators for measuring each issue. Each column's focus becomes narrower, more specific, and more tailored to the local context.

Indicators should be expressed in clear, unambiguous, and (usually) quantifiable terms, e.g. the number or percentage of affected people, assets or resources; the existence/ absence of an asset or feature. Depending on how precise the priority area is, indicators include information about the relevant population and/or geographical area they concern. Indicators should be practical – that is, data should be available and there must be an affordable, feasible means to collect data on a regular basis. They should also be reliable, meaning that change can be measured objectively over a period of time by different observers.

2.2.4 Preparing for the In-depth Assessment

The project team will need to prepare for the In-depth Assessment by

- Developing research questions
- Identifying data sources and data collection methods
- Preparing data collection instruments

To do this, it can be helpful to extend the indicator framework with the addition of three new columns, for research questions, data sources, and data collection methods, as shown in Table 4.

The column “During rapid scan look for:” in the UF Proposed indicators matrix serves as a basis to start developing the questions and data sources:

Table 4: Extension of an indicator framework for research method

Indicator	Research questions	Data source	Data collection method
	➔	➔	➔

11. Guidance: Developing a research method for the in-depth assessment

12. Example: Kigali research method development table

Developing research questions

Some of the research questions to be addressed in the In-depth Assessment are carried forward from the Rapid Scan, as they relate to specific data gaps that need to be filled through collection of primary qualitative or quantitative data.

Where the project team wishes to delve more deeply into specific areas of the food system, however, they will need to draw up their own research questions.

Each quantitative indicator will translate easily into a quantitative research question, beginning ‘how many’ or, where we need an idea of proportion, ‘what percentage’.

However, we also want to discover *why* the quantitative value is as it is and, where relevant, *who* are the people affected. To do this, we need to take each indicator in turn and formulate one or more qualitative questions.

For example, if the indicator is:

- the number of young people receiving training to start food processing enterprises

the obvious quantitative question is:

- how many young people have received training to start food processing enterprises?

Qualitative questions may be:

- which young people have received training to start food processing enterprises?
- why have these young people received training while others have not?

The aim is to develop questions to build up as complete a story as possible about provision and take-up of training courses as possible. The answers to the ‘why’ questions will reveal problems to be dealt with during action planning.

The answers to the ‘why’ questions will reveal problems to be dealt with during action planning.

For example, potential answers to ‘why have these young people received training while others have not?’ may be:

- because training provision covers some locations and not others;
- because some people can afford the fee while others cannot (and are not eligible for support);

- because training is organised in the evenings, when young men can attend more easily than young women who have family or childcare responsibilities;
- because some groups have the literacy skills to apply for a place on a training course, while others do not; etc.

Identifying data sources and data collection methods

For each research question, it will be necessary to identify first where or from whom the data may be obtained to answer (data source).

For example:

- data on young people who have received training may be obtained from the training providers;
- data on why some young people have received training may be obtained from current previous participants;
- data on those who have not received training may be obtained from a wider pool of unemployed youth.

After establishing the data source(s) from each question, it is necessary to consider the ideal data collection method for each.

Quantitative questions: Primary data collection methods will depend on what you need to quantify. You might need to conduct a **physical survey or participatory mapping** to count assets or infrastructure. For the number or percentage of stakeholders in a particular situation, you could conduct a **survey** among a representative sample group.

Qualitative questions: Qualitative questions are most likely to be answered through surveys, focus groups, or interviews.

- **Surveys** are useful for asking multiple closed-ended questions of a large cohort of people at a particular value chain node (e.g. producers, market vendors, or heads of household). It is possible to distinguish responses on the basis of factors like age, gender, socio-economic status, race, religion, to have a more precise impression of impacts on vulnerable groups.
- **One-to-one, in-depth interviews** are useful for asking specific questions of individual professionals or experts on a topic (such as heads of food processing companies or warehouse managers), to tap their knowledge or opinion. Interviews can be semi-structured, which gives the option of seeking clarification or following up on interesting answers that cover point you had not considered. Questions are also open-ended, so the subject can express an opinion in their own words.
- **Focus groups** are useful for obtaining more detailed, nuanced specialist knowledge than is possible from closed-ended surveys, from a homogenous group of 6 – 10 actors, such as farmers, market vendors, or shoppers at a market.

Where possible and practical, the project team can identify multiple possible data sources (and data collection methods) for each research question, to allow for substantiation of findings. Any additional data sources will be approached in relation to other research questions, so asking additional questions will not entail significantly more work or resources.

Each data source should be approached using only one data collection method, in which all the relevant research questions are addressed. For this reason, it is recommended to conduct a rationalisation exercise, once all data sources and appropriate data collection methods have been identified. This may entail re-ordering the columns in Table 5 as follows:

Table 5: Reorganised methodology table

Data source	Data collection method	Research questions
Source 1	Method 1	RQ1
		RQ2
		RQ3
Source 2	Method 2	RQ4
		RQ 5
		RQ 6
Source 3	Method 3	RQ 7
		RQ 8
		RQ 9

Developing data collection instruments

The re-ordered table serves as the basis for designing data collection instruments, such as survey questionnaires, interview guides, and sets of focus group questions.

The instrument for each data collection method (column 2) must be suitable for extracting the information needed from the data source for the project team to answer the assigned questions. The precise construction of these tools will vary from project to project.

Broadly speaking, **interviews** with key experts may include questions that are the same or very similar to the research questions. The research questions will need to be reworded for the interviews (rather than being expressed in abstract or third person terms). The questions are open-ended, as the intention is to obtain in-depth knowledge across an entire area. It may also be necessary to break down research questions into several interviews or survey questions to capture every dimension, including sub-questions relating to socioeconomic factors that are vital to understanding how vulnerabilities and capacities vary between different groups of stakeholders.

6. Tool: In-depth interview guide

For **surveys**, on the other hand, the research questions need to be adapted to interrogate the individuals about their own experiences (essential demographic and socioeconomic data need to be captured for each respondent, to enable disaggregation of responses for different characteristics). Surveys are also useful for the collection of spatial data. The project team needs to ensure that the questions are easy to understand and invite yes/no answers or short free responses. Where the questions are translated into the local language, it is important to test the translated versions with native speakers, to ensure they make sense and will elicit the required responses. It is also a good idea to involve field researchers or enumerators in developing the data collection instruments to ensure they can be administered as expected (if this is not possible, field researchers/enumerators should be thoroughly briefed).

13. Example: Kobo Toolbox survey

Likewise for **focus groups**, the questions need to be easy to understand and geared towards obtaining individuals' own experiences and opinions. The questions need to be open-ended and invite reflection. It is recommended that not more than 10 questions be addressed in each focus group, and that participants be a homogenous group of 6 to 10 individuals who perform the same role in the food system and have similar characteristics. It is important not to include people who may have power relations over others in the group, as this may impede people's willingness to speak freely.

14. Tool: Focus group guide

Participatory asset mapping is ideally conducted by the very people who use them (or who are assets that this is intended for). This is because outsiders may overlook some unconventional assets used by the target community or, conversely, count assets that the target community experiences barriers in accessing.

For example, participatory mapping of healthy food outlets used by young people may include fruit trees; the fruit trees would be overlooked by people who are not part of a specific group of young people because they do not know that they pick seasonal fruit to eat every time they pass by.

Outsiders may include a local food shop as a food access asset in a local area; some young people, however, may never use the shop because they are intimidated, because the price is too high, or because it does not sell the kinds of foods they would like to buy.

15. Tool: Participatory Asset Mapping (external resource) [Participatory Asset Mapping Toolkit \(communityscience.com\)](http://communityscience.com)

2.3 In-depth Assessment

The main purpose of the In-depth Assessment is to collect and analyse both quantitative and qualitative data related to the priority areas identified in the Rapid Scan, including any relevant data gaps. This detailed information allows the project team to confirm the findings of the Rapid Scan and to identify the underlying causes of problems that have been identified. The findings serve as an evidence base for action planning.

Data collection: The In-depth Assessment module involves targeted primary data collection, through methods such as field surveys, interviews with individual food system stakeholders, focus groups, participatory asset mapping, etc.

Analysis/reflection: The project team will need to analyse/reflect on the findings in order to confirm and fine-tune the proposed priority areas for action. It may be necessary to update the indicator framework accordingly.

Reporting: The project team will produce a written report of the In-depth assessment findings, as an extension to the Rapid Scan report. They will also produce a visual dashboard of the findings, based on a template to be provided. The report will include a list of priority areas for action, to be taken forward for city action planning.

Timing: It is suggested to spend a total of 4 – 5 weeks on the In-depth Assessment (2 – 3 weeks on collecting data – although the time needed will depend on the study design, including number of priority areas to be investigated – and at least 2 weeks on reflection and reporting.

2.3.1 Reflection/analysis

Following data collection, the project team will need to conduct analysis. This may be in two stages: Initial analysis and second-level analysis.

The analysis of data collected during the in-depth assessment allows the project team to answer the research questions.

Quantitative analysis can be done through easy sifting and organisation of quantitative data (as well as some qualitative data from close-ended questions) and the creation of charts, graphs and tables. (This may be done using survey software with built-in analysis, such as KoBo Toolbox).

Qualitative analysis systematises the responses from multiple sources in order to answer the research questions. This involves developing a coding framework based on the research questions, which is used to code relevant sections of the transcribed interviews/ focus groups. Several software solutions exist to enable researchers to code text and to re-organize text selections by topic, for systematisation of responses by multiple participants.

16. Tool: Qualitative analysis software

17. Guidance: Analysis of In-depth Assessment findings

Once the project team has answered each of the quantitative (how many/what proportion) and qualitative (what, how, who, which, why) questions relating to each priority area/indicator, they will be able to build a narrative to further explain the problems identified, and their causes.

2.4 City strategy

As came out of the City Selection, several cities do have a Food Systems and/or Youth Strategy, or have developed one in the past. As mentioned above, it is paramount to align the Urban Futures Action Plan to this. If there is no tangible strategy as of yet, the Action Planning referred to here, will be a first step, focused on Urban Futures Action Planning, but with the aim to support the city and its citizens in developing a comprehensive Action Plan.

The Urban Futures Action Planning will mark the beginning of the implementation phase. Strictly it does not fall under the Assessment approach as indicated above, but it will be co-designed during the Assessment.

The main purpose of Action Planning then is to devise interventions to address the underlying causes of the problems, vulnerabilities, and lack of resilience capacities identified during the In-Depth Assessment, and to put in place roadmaps and to implement them. City Strategic Action Planning, Implementation and Monitoring, It is an iterative process, and involves various steps. This section refers to the first step.



NOTE ON POLICY MAKING

Note that action planning is NOT the complete cycle of policy-making.

Often, action planning results in recommendations and provision of evidence. The decision on whether to act on the recommendations and evidence will be made by high-level decision-makers or elected councillors within council chambers.

phase in case interventions do not deliver expected results and must be adjusted, or in case additional outreach and engagement is needed.



NOTE ON MONITORING ACTIONS

It is extremely important to determine how the impact of an action will be monitored while the action is being developed. If monitoring is considered as an afterthought, there is a risk that it will be too late to develop meaningful measures or ensure that data can be collected in an economic way.

In addition, there should be a clear connection between the monitoring mechanism of actions and the outcomes (and related measurable change and indicators) that they have been designed to contribute to.

Work document - DO NOT DISSEMINATE