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Background

• Globally, there is a commitment to end hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition (SDG 2) and make cities safe and sustainable (SDG 11)

• However, poverty and food insecurity are rising in urban areas

• In Nairobi, 1 million people (a quarter of the city population) are hungry; similar proportion are overweight leading to increase in diet-related non-communicable diseases

• Various policy and governance frameworks for food system exist to combat malnutrition

• **However, minimal understanding on extent to which urban policies and governance provide an enabling environment for a sustainable urban food system**

• This paper examines; i) the linkages between urban food policies and their governance frameworks and; ii) extent to which they support a sustainable food system

• Review of urban policies complimented with 27 key informant interviews involving actors in the urban food system in Nairobi City (Pop: 4 million)
Food Policy: Kenya context

• Kenya Constitution - Articles 43 (1) C; 53 (l) (c); 21, 22 and 60:
  • Provides right to be free from hunger, access to food of acceptable quality, children rights to good nutrition and right to own or access land

  • Focus on food access to the poor Provides for coordination btn. national & County govt.
  • Propose - Food Security Authority (FSA) and committees
  • Bill not passed into law

• Prior to 2010, food policy was viewed as largely a rural issue
• Lack of consideration for urban food issues was identified as a critical gap in the MDGs (Battersby, 2016)
## Urban food policies in Kenya

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policies</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Draft National Urban and Peri-Urban Agri & Livestock Policy, 2011 | Created U-turn on urban agriculture issues  
Not finalized and need revision to reflect new governance structure |
| Nairobi Urban Agriculture Production Regulation Act 2015     | Legalizes agriculture in the City  
Dept. of Agriculture set up – focus production Advisory authority not set up  
Does not address complexities of land issues |
| Urban Areas and Cities Act No. 13 Of 2011                   | City integrated plan done – recognize agriculture; fragmented approach to planning         |
| The Physical planning Act 2011                             | Land use classified as commercial or industrial; Change of user process is slow and complex |
| Public Health Act                                           | Some aspects of livestock production still considered a nuisance or cause harmful pollution of water supplies |
Governance arrangements for urban food system

**Land use and production**
Ministries of Agriculture, Lands, Planning, Health, Education; The National Land Commission; County Governments; Surveys of Kenya, Department of Remote Sensing and urban food producers

**Food marketing and Trade**
Ministries (Trade, industrialization) informal traders, supermarkets, multinational food firms

**Food Distribution**
County Government, Ministries and agencies (Transport, Trade; social protection), NGOs;

**Food Consumption (including food safety)**
Ministries of Agriculture, Health; County Government Departments; KEBS, Pharmacy and Poisons Board, Public Health Standards Board, professional associations and regulatory boards (e.g. Veterinary Board, Public Health Officers and Technicians Council, Food Manufacturers, private sector; business associations and civil society

**Food and Nutrition Security**
### Strengths and weaknesses of urban food policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food System Objective</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing equitable access (physical and economic) for all citizens to healthy and affordable food</td>
<td>• Agricultural Production now legal&lt;br&gt;• Actions noted for home and community gardening especially for low income groups</td>
<td>No explicit actions to regulate prices and control quality of basic staples, fruits and vegetables and on improving food distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure adequate nutrition and public health for people at risk of malnutrition</td>
<td>• Seek to identify marginalized groups and mainstream support mechanisms&lt;br&gt;• Actions proposed to enhance production of food by the marginalized groups</td>
<td>Allocation of land not yet implemented&lt;br&gt;Advisory authority not yet formed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote food production in city region</td>
<td>National spatial plan now recognize agriculture as an urban land use&lt;br&gt;Institutional arrangements for food production proposed and County Department operational</td>
<td>The Planning &amp; Public Health Acts still constraining&lt;br&gt;Implementation of key aspects NUALPRA yet to happen&lt;br&gt;No measurable goals and indicators for success</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions & policy Implications

• Many good policies but scattered and therefore difficult for a city to implement
• Suggests need for a comprehensive food policy – involving multistakeholder consultations
• Food policy continue to be productionist and rural oriented; limited attention on food distribution and processing
• Complex governance structure; many actors with conflicting interests and minimal coordination
  • Including: Ministries of Agriculture, Health, Treasury, Planning and Education; Government Regulatory agencies (NEMA, KEBS, PCB, KEPHIS, etc) County Government Departments; Food Security Agency, Food Security Committees, County food security committees, Courts of law, Private sector organisations
• Implementation of policies is weak or lacking
  • associated with complex governance framework
  • lack specific actions for implementation and indicators for succes

• Role of private sector, especially in distribution of food not prioritized
• Need for improved coordination and consideration of complex spatial and social relations among food system actors
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