TRANSFORMING THE FOOD SYSTEM THROUGH FOOD SECURITY AND FOOD SOVEREIGNTY: COMPARING THE FOOD POLICIES OF ISTANBUL AND IZMIR METROPOLITAN MUNICIPALITIES IN TURKEY

by

Gökçe Pınar Gerçek

B.Sc. in Molecular Biology and Genetics, Istanbul Technical University, 2011

Submitted to the Institute of Environmental Sciences

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Science

in

Environmental Sciences

Boğaziçi University

2022

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to start this section with expressing my gratitude to my advisor Assist. Prof. Pınar Ertör- Akyazı for her endless support, positivity, patience, wisdom and encouragement. I feel so lucky to have met you and your mentorship has been invaluable to me. Thank you for your guidance, motivational talks, keeping me rooted in reality and believing in me.

I would like to thank my committee members Assoc. Prof. Dr. Zeynep Kadirbeyoğlu and Assist. Prof. Dr. Banu Koçer Reisman for accepting to be in my jury and for sharing their valuable comments and suggestions. Also, I would like to thank Prof. Begüm Özkaynak, Assist. Prof. Cem İskender Aydın, Assist. Prof. Irmak Ertör, Dr. Duygu Avcı and Assist. Prof. İrem Daloğlu Çetinkaya. I am so grateful to each of you for your academic and non-academic supports. Additionally, I would like to express my gratefulness to Selma and Çetin from the Yerdeniz Consumer Cooperative.

A huge thanks and gratitude go to my lovely family. Thank you very much for supporting my decision to quit my job and start building a whole new career on my long-time love- social sciences. Thank you, mom and dad, for hugs and kisses; Deniz, Işık and Baki for all the laughs; Magnus and Noi for being hilarious and affectionate; Emir for challenging me, loving me and being there.

A special thanks go to all my friends, but especially to Begüm and Gizem. You have been wonderful friends to me. Lastly, I would like to thank Melis, Ata, Luna, Büke and Mutlu for all the fun we had (and will have).

ABSTRACT

TRANSFORMING THE FOOD SYSTEM THROUGH FOOD SECURITY AND FOOD SOVEREIGNTY: COMPARING THE FOOD POLICIES OF ISTANBUL AND IZMIR METROPOLITAN MUNICIPALITIES IN TURKEY

Urbanization, industrialization, globalization, and the climate crisis are leading to alarming rates of food insecurity within urban contexts, increasing social and ecological inequities. Cities are assuming a leading role in agri-food policymaking due to their potential to offer place-based and targeted solutions and create new spaces for participation. In this context, food security and food sovereignty concepts are increasingly referred to, however, to date, there are only few studies comparing municipal governments' role in urban food policy making and their transformative potential based on the frameworks of food security and food sovereignty. This study aims to contribute to critical food studies by investigating urban food policies of Istanbul and Izmir Metropolitan Municipalities in Turkey. Based on in-depth interviews with representatives from these two municipalities, producer and consumer cooperatives, scholar-activists, a review of formal municipal documents and participant observation methods, the present study identifies commonalities and differences relevant for the transformation of the food policies in these two cities from the perspective of food security and food sovereignty. The results demonstrate that urban food policies in Istanbul and Izmir mainly focus on small-scale farmer supports and increasing food security of their residents, while the degree of adoption of main food sovereignty principles varies. The findings reveal that even though there are substantial efforts towards more progressive food policy making, both cities are in need of more comprehensive and integrated approaches enabling participation of different stakeholders to operationalize food security and food sovereignty.

ÖZET

GIDA SİSTEMİNİ GIDA GÜVENCESİ VE GIDA EGEMENLİĞİ İLE DÖNÜŞTÜRMEK: TÜRKİYE'DE İSTANBUL VE İZMİR BÜYÜKŞEHİR BELEDİYELERİ'NİN GIDA POLİTİKALARININ KARŞILAŞTIRMASI

Kentleşme, sanayileşme, küreselleşme ve iklim krizi kentsel bağlamda endişe verici oranlarda gıda güvencesizliğine yol açmakta, sosyal ve ekolojik eşitsizlikleri körüklemektedir. Kentler, yer temelli ve hedefe yönelik çözümler önerebilmesi sayesinde tarım ve gıda politikalarında öncü bir rol üstlenmekte ve katılım için yeni alanlar üretmektedir. Bu bağlamda gıda güvencesi ve gıda egemenliği sıklıkla başvurulan kavramlar olmakla birlikte şimdiye kadar yerel yönetimlerin kentsel gıda politikalarının oluşturma süreçlerindeki rolü ve söz konusu kavramlar çerçevesinde dönüştürücü gücüyle ilgili karşılaştırmalı pek az çalışma yapılmıştır. Bu çalışma, Türkiye'de İstanbul ve İzmir Büyükşehir Belediyeleri'nin kentsel gıda politikalarını inceleyerek eleştirel gıda literatürüne katkıda bulunmayı amaçlamaktadır. Her iki belediyeden konuyla ilgili çalışma yürüten temsilciler, üretici ve tüketici kooperatifleri, bilim insanları ve aktivistlerle yapılan derinlemesine mülakatlar; resmi belediye belgelerinin incelenmesi, katılımcı gözlemci yöntemler kullanılarak elde edilen bilgiler gıda egemenliği ve gıda güvencesi çerçevesinde değerlendirilmiş, bu bağlamda gıda politikalarının dönüşümüyle ilgili ortaklaşan ve farklılaşan noktalar belirlenmiştir. Sonuçlar İstanbul ve İzmir'in gıda politikalarının çoğunlukla küçük ölçekli çiftçilerin desteklenmesi ve bu şehirlerde yaşayan insanların gıda güvencelerinin güçlendirilmesine odaklandığını, fakat gıda egemenliğinin temel prensiplerin benimsenme derecesi konusunda farklılıklar olduğunu göstermektedir. Elde edilen bulgular, daha ilerici gıda politikası oluşturmaya yönelik önemli çabalar olmasına rağmen, her iki şehrin de gıda güvencesi ve gıda egemenliğini işler hale getirmek için farklı paydaşların katılımını mümkün kılan daha kapsamlı ve bütünleşik yaklaşımlara ihtiyaç duyduğunu ortaya koymaktadır.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS iii
ABSTRACT iv
ÖZET v
TABLE OF CONTENTS vi
LIST OF FIGURES viii
LIST OF TABLES ix
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS x
1. INTRODUCTION 1
2. LITERATURE REVIEW 5
2.1. The role of municipalities in local food policy 5
2.2. Food security 6
2.3. Food sovereignty 8
2.4. The transformative potential of local food policies 11
3. METHODOLOGY 14
4. FOOD POLICY IN ISTANBUL VERSUS IZMIR: A TALE OF TWO CITIES 16
4.1. Introduction to the case studies 16
4.2. Background: Understanding food policies and provision in the context of Turkey 18
4.3. The case of Istanbul 19
4.4. The case of Izmir 21
5. RESULTS 25
5.1. Food governance strategies and main policies 25
5.2. Participation and democratization efforts 29
5.3. Ecological production efforts 31
5.4. Contract farming 33
5.5. Theoretical and technical efforts 34
5.6. Access to agriculture- and food-related data 35
5.7. National and international network building 36
5.8. A focus on the economic returns to agriculture 37
5.9. Ability to feed the city's residents 39
5.10. Food security and food sovereignty 40
6. DISCUSSION 44

7. CONCLUSION 49
REFERENCES 50
APPENDIX A: SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW QUESTIONS 58
APPENDIX B: SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW QUESTIONS (TURKISH) 61
APPENDIX C: QUOTES FROM INTERVIEWS 64

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 4.1. Location of the case studies: Istanbul and Izmir in Turkey……..... 16

Figure 5.1. Producer and cooperative market in Kadıköy, Istanbul.....27

Figure 5.2. Producer and cooperative market in Kültürpark, Izmir ……27

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1. List of interviewees.…… 14

Table 4.1. City characteristics and agricultural capacities of Istanbul and Izmir...…….... 16

Table 4.2. A list of main governing bodies, strategic processes and policy actions in terms of food policies in Istanbul and Izmir …… 23

Table 5.1. A short summary of the study's findings for the food policies of IBB and IZBB…… 41

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviation	Explanation
ARIP	Agrarian Reform Implementation Project
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
IBB	Istanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi
IPA	Istanbul Planning Agency
ISYON	Istanbul Management Renewal Inc.
IZBB	Izmir Büyükşehir Belediyesi
MUFPP	Milan Urban Food Policy Pact
TEPAV	The Economic Policy Research Foundation in Turkey
WTO	World Trade Organization

1. INTRODUCTION

In the last several decades, food and agriculture had been solely associated with rural settings while their relation to urban spaces had been overlooked (Doernberg et al., 2019). Considered a rural issue, food and agriculture were absent in the debates on urban policies in most of the twentieth century and the association was not re-established until the oil crisis in 1970s (Pothukuchi and Kaufman, 1999). Before the industrial revolution, the structuring of the cities was directly based on their food provision systems (Bricas and Conaré, 2019; Baker and de Zeeuw, 2015). But in the post-industrial revolution period, cities and food provision have become disconnected, while agriculture and livestock breeding have been swept out of the urban areas to the peripheries as a result of urbanization, industrialization and globalization (Bricas and Conaré, 2019; Doernberg et al., 2019). This detachment was not limited to the spatial aspects but also extended to social, economic, political and perceptional factors (Bricas and Conaré, 2019).

Simultaneously, agri-food policies were focusing on rural landscapes while they were being devised at the national and global scale, through international organizations such as Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and World Trade Organization (WTO) (Doernberg et al., 2019). The gradual separation of urban policies from food and agriculture undermined the potential role of municipal governments in the agri-food policymaking, except for land-use management and the implementation of national or regional agendas (Baker and de Zeeuw, 2015). After a long period of ignoring urban food issues, cities recently started to assume a growing role in building their own food strategies encompassing all the stages of the food system such as "production, processing, distribution, access, consumption and waste management" (Conaré, 2019, p. xiv). Given the global trend of increasing urbanization, according to which the fraction of individuals living in cities will reach 60 percent of the global population by 2030[1], cities will arguably play critical roles in the governance of food and agriculture in the coming decades (Bricas and Conaré, 2019).

Scientific research on sustainability and environmental policies had been, for a long while, also mostly disconnected from city-level analysis as more attention was paid to global- scale issues for years (Heynen et al. 2006). But the recent challenges such as fluctuating food prices, ever pressing issues related with climate change and the unsustainable practices in the food system gave rise to a

[1]https://www.un.org/development/desa/pd/sites/www.un.org.development.desa.pd/files/undes_pd_2020_popfacts_urbanization_policies.pdf

strengthened focus on cities with respect to food and agriculture-related issues (Sonnino, 2019). Correspondingly, in the last two decades, both local governments as well as urban citizens started to realize their potential role on transforming the food system (Doernberg et al., 2019; Vara-Sánchez et al., 2021). As a result, currently, food policies are increasingly considered in municipal programs and plans, even though municipalities often do not have a "clear formal mandate" for food-related issues. Still, municipalities and local governments' attempts to construct strategic and place-based agendas to address food issues in their localities are on the rise (Doernberg et al., 2019; Battersby, 2017).

Recently, there is evidence that municipal food agendas increasingly transcend their rather limited policy scopes related to local hunger and health issues and go beyond disconnected approaches to the food system by developing, instead, more holistic food policies connecting social, ecological and economic perspectives (Cohen and Ilieva, 2021; Moragues-Faus et al., 2013; Sonnino, 2019). These comprehensive policies include, but are not limited to, land-use management, transportation, infrastructure, housing, ecological preservation, education and worker rights (Cohen and Ilieva, 2021; Moragues-Faus et al., 2013). This novel approach also enables local municipalities to address social, ecological and economic equity issues (Battersby, 2017; Moragues-Faus et al., 2013). Further, it has been argued that novel spaces are emerging within cities rendering the inclusion of different actors possible in the context of democratization of the food systems in the cities (Moragues-Faus and Morgan, 2015).

As described by Hawkes and Halliday, the definition and scope of urban food policies is "…a concerted action on the part of city government to address food-related challenges. Urban food policies often emerge through significant involvement of civil society and other actors, […] however, grassroots, citizen-led actions that are independent of governments do not constitute urban food policies per se." (Hawkes and Halliday, 2017, p. 9). Following the pioneering cities of Toronto, Belo Horizonte and San Francisco developing their own urban food policies in the years 1991, 1993, and 1997, respectively, agricultural and food-related agendas started to become part of municipal governments policies in several cities in both the Global North and the Global South such as London, Malmö, Cape Town, Rotterdam, Quito and Mexico City (Baker and de Zeeuw, 2015; Doernberg et al., 2019). These urban food policy initiatives can consist of local actions at a specific area or go beyond the city boundaries and create multinational alliances between local governments such as Milan Urban Food Policy Pact (MUFPP)[2], which has been signed by more than 200 cities as of the year 2022 (Candel, 2020; Smaal et al., 2021). Istanbul was the first metropolitan municipality in

[2] https://www.milanurbanfoodpolicypact.org

Turkey to sign this transnational pact[3]. Urban food policies are relatively new to the local governments in Turkey with the exceptions of a few district-level municipalities such as Mezitli (Mersin), Efeler (Aydın), Nilüfer (Bursa) and recently the metropolitan municipality of Istanbul (ibid).

In the growing body of literature on food and agriculture in Turkey, so far, there has been little reflection about the role of municipal governments in building a democratic and equitable food system. The scientific literature on food security and food sovereignty in Turkey has mainly focused on alternative food initiatives (Atalan-Helicke and Abiral, 2021; Öz and Aksoy, 2019; Kadirbeyoğlu and Konya, 2017; Al and Küçük, 2019), urban agriculture (Kaldjian, 2003; Shopov, 2021), sustainable agri-food transitions from the multi-level perspective (Özatağan and Karakaya Ayalp, 2021); food supply chains (Kurtsal et al., 2020; Türkkan, 2018), and rural governance and development through agriculture (Yetişkul et al., 2021). However, it is necessary to further our understanding regarding the potential of local governments and urban food policies and what they mean for the construction of food security and food sovereignty in Turkey, given their potential for transformation as indicated by the international literature on food sovereignty and urban food policies. Therefore, this study explores the emerging concept of urban food policies of local governments based on food security and food sovereignty frameworks, using two large metropolitan municipalities of Turkey, Istanbul and Izmir, as case studies. Both Istanbul and Izmir have gone through local elections fairly recently and have new governments with new mayors, with interesting commonalities and differences regarding their imaginations and emphases on agricultural and food-related agendas. As such, these two cases were selected based on their potential to provide new insights towards transformation of urban food policies and to become role models for other local municipalities of Turkey. Identification of their common as well as divergent practices will further our understanding of the various ways in which food security and food sovereignty is operationalized in urban contexts.

The key research questions I would like to answer in the present study are the following:

- How do the representatives of Istanbul and Izmir Municipal Governments perceive food sovereignty- and food security- related issues in their own jurisdictions?
- What are the commonalities and differences between the discourses and actions of these two local governments on food?
- Do their food policies entail any considerations about achieving a more democratic food system?

[3] https://www.milanurbanfoodpolicypact.org

To answer these questions, I conducted eleven semi-structured interviews with representatives from both municipalities, as well as other stakeholders from producer organizations, urban food initiatives and scholar-activists. I also systematically reviewed available formal and informal food policy documents of both municipalities to explore the "how" and "why" of food policy making in these two local governments.

The remainder of the thesis is structured as follows. The next section (Section 2) provides a literature review by presenting an overview of the role of municipalities in local food policy, discussing food security and food sovereignty and the transformative potential of local food policies. Section 3 describes the methodology adopted and provides a list of the interviewees. Section 4 introduces the cases of Istanbul and Izmir, explores the historical context and provides further contextual data regarding their agricultural potentials. Section 5 summarizes the qualitative results of the interviews and Section 6 discusses them in relation to the current literature on the role of municipalities in food policymaking. Finally, the last section concludes this discussion by pointing out to the potentials and limitations in both cities.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. The role of municipalities in local food policy

Cities are novel yet increasingly essential players in the food policy arena. Although their ability to build a sustainable urban food system is limited given the complex relations between their jurisdiction and the central government's stance and authority regarding food policy making, local governments have the opportunity and capability to develop innovative food policy initiatives that may be by and large absent at the national scale (Fages and Bricas, 2017; Broad Leib, 2013; Cohen and Ilieva, 2021). Recently, the changing role of central governments due to the adoption of neoliberal policies led to a revival in municipalism, recently coined as "new municipalism", which emphasizes that municipalities are "more autonomous political and economic agents with respect to the central state" (Thompson, 2021; Morley and Morgan, 2021, p. 3). Hence, in the last two decades, local governments have started to develop their own food strategies as a result of their increasing awareness that food system issues are context-dependent and necessitate local, customized policies with a potential for more direct and targeted solutions than what states can offer (Baker and de Zeeuw, 2015; Broad Leib, 2013; Doernberg et al., 2019). Such initiatives often address discrete issues corresponding to a certain stage of the food system; or several problems in the food system by emphasizing the need for sustainable, equitable and health-oriented approaches to food in general; or they may attempt to generate transformative spaces for a participatory and democratic food policies by bringing all the related actors together (Kay et al., 2018; Sonnino, 2019).

The COVID-19 pandemic demonstrated the inability of national and international scales to address food security issues in crisis times and strengthened the case for the contribution of local level governance to food issues (FAO, 2020; Loker and Francis, 2020). To ensure food security, local governments are suggested to develop a multi-stakeholder urban food governance approach and encourage local production and prevent the fragility of the food system in urban settings (FAO, 2020). However, one has also to note that local governments often have limited autonomy in terms of legislative frameworks and financial possibilities. Therefore, glorifying the abilities of local governments and positioning the national governments against them as useless political organizations would be misleading (Moragues- Faus and Morgan, 2015). Nevertheless, local governments are exclusive actors with a potential to enable coordination between municipalities and the civil society, and to transform the food system in the cities as they may embody more democratic and autonomous agents of change (Kay et al., 2018).

Urban agri-food policies, plans, strategies and regulations have started to be developed and implemented by numerous cities from countries all over the world including China, Brazil, South Africa, Canada, the USA and several European countries (Baker and de Zeeuw, 2015; Sonnino, 2014). The coverage of these actions can be limited to "single-issue policies" which focus on particular aspects of the food system or they can have a broader perspective and address multiple elements of the food system while also considering the dynamics between them (Baker and de Zeeuw, 2015). The food system comprises of multiple stages starting from the way food is produced; continuing with how it is processed, transported, and delivered; how the consumers reach it; and ending with its treatment as waste. Therefore, there are various types of actions that local governments can take by setting the framework of municipal agri-food policies and agendas based on the food system contextualization for the establishment of a resilient and sustainable food system at the urban scale (Massachusetts Food System Collaborative, 2018). In fact, urban agri-food policymaking has undergone changes in the course of time towards including more comprehensive approaches of food system framework, acknowledging the multiscale governance and building the relations between different actors in the urban food policymaking (Moragues-Faus and Battersby, 2021). Additionally, the scope of urban food policymaking has been expanded in the last two decades to embrace a more holistic approach by taking wages and work conditions of the laborers, fairly priced housing and education policies into account (Cohen and Ilieva, 2021). However, the role of local municipalities in food policymaking in Turkey has, to the best of my knowledge, received limited attention so far. Urban agriculture, urban food initiatives and food supply chains of big metropoles like Istanbul have been drawing much attention in scientific circles (Kaldjian, 2003; Shopov, 2021, Atalan-Helicke and Abiral, 2021; Öz and Aksoy, 2019; Kadirbeyoğlu and Konya, 2017; Al and Küçük, 2019, Kurtsal et al., 2020; Türkkan, 2018), yet, a comprehensive comparative analysis for local food policy making at the municipal scale has been lacking, especially in the context of food security and food sovereignty, which I discuss in the following subsections.

2.2. Food security

The challenges of the global food system have been predominantly discussed with the "food security" rhetoric for a long time (Thompson et al., 2020). In the 1970s, the food aid programs from the USA were becoming less relevant due to political and economic reasons, food crisis was on the rise and several economic crises were occurring particularly in the Global North with severe repercussions for food provision (Zerbe, 2018). As a result, the need was felt for an international organization overseeing and addressing some of these problems, and that gave rise to the organization of the World Food Conference in 1974 (Overseas Development Institute, 1997). The food security

concept emerged from these debates on the global food crisis amidst financial turmoil and the world food system becoming uncontrollable (Maxwell, 1996).

The early concerns regarding food security entailed how to ensure continuous food supply and attenuate extreme volatility of food prices. Back then, food security was viewed as more of a "food problem" in which the main concerns were about producing and supplying enough food and bringing balance to its trade in the world (Overseas Development Institute, 1997). However, the sustained supply of food on a national and global scale was not able to eradicate hunger, and that increasingly changed the focus from supply of food to access to food (Maxwell, 1996). That is, even though worldwide food supply was in adequate amounts, some individuals were able to eat enough while some others still suffered from undernourishment due to having no or limited access to food due to their inability to "produce, buy or trade things for it" (Sen, 1982; Clapp, 2014). Therefore, later in 1983, FAO broadened the definition of food security by adding a third dimension regarding "securing access by vulnerable people to available supplies" (Overseas Development Institute, 1997). Nevertheless, it was not until the late 1980s that the new definition entailing ability to access food was widely accepted. The commonly used current version of food security emerged with the expansion of the definition in the 1996 World Food Summit to include the "social" dimension (Clapp, 2014). The rephrased definition in "The State of Food Insecurity" in 2001 was therefore as follows: "Food security [is] a situation that exists when all people, at all times, have physical, social and economic access to sufficient, safe and nutritious food that meets their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life" (FAO, 2001).

Still, food security concept is often criticized for putting food supply and availability to the center without being able to achieve eradication of hunger, especially in the 1970s (Timmermann, 2019; Clapp, 2014). More specifically, neoliberal agri-food policies based on market incentives and international trading has been utilizing this concept as it is broadly in line with industrialized food industry (Timmermann, 2019). However, critiques have underlined that does not give particular importance to access to food and not question the way and by whom the food is produced (Clapp, 2014; Thompson et al., 2020). Yet, there are more extensive and advanced food security discourses which take the social dimension into account than merely production-oriented neoliberal ones (Clapp, 2014). The food security approach has also been criticized for being inherently market- and free-trade oriented and putting too much emphasis on the neoliberal implications of the individual level by placing the ability to buy at the center and reflecting the valuation of personal choices in market over "collective policy choices" (ibid). Although the criticisms towards food security make often very

legitimate points, it has been argued that it is still possible to obtain useful insights from food security discussions, rather than refusing the term altogether (ibid).

Despite the interest in the relationship of food security, urban food policies and local governments, the academic literature often does not make use of a dual framework of food security and food sovereignty. The focus is usually on either one, most probably because they have often been positioned as opposed poles (Clapp, 2014). However, arguably, this can be incomplete as they can actually complement each other in an analysis focusing on transformation for both consumers and producers. Instead, getting beyond this binary, as Clapp (2014) argues, could be fruitful for investigating urban food policies. The following subsection therefore focuses on the literature on food sovereignty with an eye on the food sovereignty movement in Turkey.

2.3. Food sovereignty

The underemphasized "*from where*" and "*produced how*" questions of food security resulted in the emergence of three debates relying more strongly on normative aspects of food (as opposed to the rather descriptive concept of food security). These three approaches are food sovereignty, food justice and food democracy (Thompson et al., 2020). Voicing strong opposition to the neoliberalization and industrialization of the food system, the transnational peasant organization La Vía Campesina put forth the term "food sovereignty" in 1996 at the Rome World Food Summit, which is today both a concept and a social movement at the same time (Edelman et al., 2014; Thompson et al., 2020).

Food sovereignty puts normative aspects and ethics with respect to food production to the central position and places emphasis on ecological production (agroecology), equity, localism, regionalism, on communities lacking power and giving voice to marginalized people such as small-scale farmers and landless rural workers (Thompson et al., 2020). The different pillars of food sovereignty refer to the damaging impacts of the current capitalist, corporatist and imperialist food regime and the need to restructuring markets and forms of ownership (Holt-Giménez and Shattuck, 2011). Contrary to the term food security, food sovereignty concept and movement unequivocally objects to the food production and distribution subject to heavy usage of chemicals within industrialized production (Edelman et al., 2014). In contrast, the widely recognized definition of food security is mainly a descriptive concept involving issues of how to increase production and to improve access to food (Clapp, 2014).

Moreover, food sovereignty concept aims to give people, especially small-scale producers, the decision-making and governance right on their own food production and distribution mechanisms. This involves the questioning of land, water and seed ownership; how current agricultural practices affect the environment and whose interests the current food system really serves; and challenging of neoliberal agricultural policies. In practice, these questions have appealed both to producers and consumers who strive for a transformation of the food system and with this wide appeal among activists, food sovereignty concept has turned into a global social movement (Holt-Giménez and Lammeren, 2018). However, it should also be noted that in practice there are various interpretations of food sovereignty, ranging from more radical understandings challenging capitalism as a system to "national-popular or 'subhegemonic'" co-opted versions (Tilzey, 2019; Tilzey, 2020, p.12).

On the other hand, food sovereignty has received criticism[4] due to its local-oriented ideals, which are potentially challenging to be scaled up globally, its lack of focus on long-distance trade, and for romanticizing the impact of local farmers, and for being not able to offer a transnational approach and address animal welfare (Thompson et al., 2020).

Food security, food sovereignty, food justice and food democracy have each idiosyncratic bases in terms of their experiential and conceptual approaches. The concerns that they aim to address about the food system, the components they stress, and their spatial focus vary a lot (Thompson et al., 2020). While it is beyond the scope of this thesis to compare these three approaches in detail, it is important to note that food security and food sovereignty are the terms widely used in the context of Turkey, rather than food justice and food democracy. While the academic literature has conceptualized food security and sovereignty as stark opposites to each other, it has been recently argued that they do not completely contradict each other (Clapp, 2014). Instead, it is possible to read them as connected and intersected since both have the potential to change the current status-quo and draw attention to dissimilar spatial levels, actors and concerns (Thompson et al., 2020). This approach is in line with the present study's analysis as well.

To a great extent, food sovereignty literature concentrates spatially on rural areas and thematically on peasant movements (Tornaghi and Dehaene, 2020). Urban food sovereignty has not been extensively studied and the research on case studies and comparative analysis has been quite limited. There are a few case studies in the literature focusing on urban food advocates (Lyons, 2014), urban food producers (Siebert, 2019), political agroecological practices of urban activists (Tornaghi

[4] For additional information on this topic, please refer to The Journal of Peasant Studies, Volume 41, Issue 6 (2014)- Global Agrarian Transformations Volume 2: Critical Perspectives on Food Sovereignty.

and Dehaene, 2020) and an evaluation of food sovereignty in the city (García-Sempere et al., 2019). Each of these studies are pivotal in the expansion of urban food sovereignty scholarship, yet there is little reference to the potentials of local governments in transforming the food system with the use of the food sovereignty concept and practice.

Food sovereignty, both as a term and a social movement, is currently present in Turkey as well. After the 1980s, trade agreements and neoliberal policies started to change agricultural practices in Turkey. One of the most influential decisions of the government in this respect occurred in 2001 with the Agrarian Reform Implementation Project (ARIP) (Al and Küçük, 2019). The agricultural structure of Turkey had changed in terms of government subsidies, forms of production and with regards to the presence and strength of cooperatives during privatization processes. Another factor strengthening the corporatization of food in Turkey was the Seed Law adopted in 2006 which disabled farmers to sell their seeds (Kocagöz and Doğançayır, 2017).

ARIP and Seed Law put farmers in a difficult position, and they started to form organized opposition against these projects (Aydın, 2010; Kocagöz and Doğançayır, 2017). In order to unite the farmer unions, which were based separately on each product (like grapes and tobacco) and to be able to carry out a common struggle together, a confederation was formed with the consensus of these unions, and the Turkish Farmers Union Confederation Çiftçi-Sen was founded on May 24, 2008. Çiftçi-Sen was the pioneer in terms of initiating food sovereignty as a social movement uniting both small-scale producers and urban consumers. However, after the establishment of the confederation, Çiftçi-Sen went through a difficult process of dealing with lawsuits opened up to close it[5]. In February 2020, seven different farmer unions representing different agricultural products (grape, tobacco, nuts, sunflower, grains, olive and tea) came together to form one central union to replace the previous confederation structure[6]. Furthermore, in the last decade, alternative food initiatives such as food communities and consumer cooperatives started to emerge in support of small-scale ecological farmers, initially with the support of Çiftçi-Sen and then widening through one-to-one connection and mutual learning between different consumer-based food initiatives (Edwards, 2016; Kocagöz and Doğançayır, 2017). As such, this process of using food sovereignty as a concept to unite small-scale ecological producers with urban middle-class consumers concerned about the current industrial food system was mainly initiated by producer organizations, and later adopted by urban consumers, especially in Istanbul and Izmir, later expanding to other cities in Turkey. There is continuous

[5] http://www.ciftcisen.org/2021/01/25/ciftcilerin-sendikalasmalari-engellenemez/
[6] https://www.birgun.net/haber/ciftci-sen-de-yeni-donem-sirketlerin-gida-sistemine-karsi-halkin-gida-sistemini-kuracagiz-289304

communication and network building among these initiatives, and they increase in number day by day. Yet, their potential to influence urban food policies in Turkey has not been investigated in depth so far.

2.4. The transformative potential of local food policies

The transformative potential of local food policies has been highlighted in several studies. For instance, it has been argued that the failure of the global food systems to provide the right to healthy and nutritious food for all and the exacerbation of the ecological problems such as climate crisis, waste mismanagement, and economic, social and health-related inequities can be addressed by urban food policies in harmony with national and international level policies (Hawkes and Halliday, 2017; Bricas, 2019). Accordingly, the challenges of the food system and its complexities can be dealt with in a multiscalar way while urban planning can be reimagined both for the people and planet (Hawkes and Halliday, 2017).

Similarly, Sonnino (2019) discerned four central values present in the municipal food policies from several cities in the UK, USA and Canada for social and cultural capacity building. These values include i) food system perspective accompanied by an understanding of food as a multifunctional public good, ii) inclusion of civil society in the decision-making, iii) re-localizing the food system through inclusiveness and flexibility, and iv) bringing the different scales together. These values and social and cultural capacity building opportunities turn urban food policies into spaces with the potential to fulfill multiple and connected sustainability targets and carry a step further to make food policymaking participatory and transformative (Sonnino, 2019). However, it should be noted that the incorporation of "social justice and social justice-oriented food concepts" including food security and food sovereignty remains limited in urban food policies, restricting their transformative potential (Smaal et al., 2021).

Municipal governments hold tools and opportunities such as tendering food for public places including schools, hospitals; organizing land use in an ecological way contributing to mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions; promoting novel governance forms like food policy councils; creating social and economic inclusion spaces for local actors such as small-scale farmers and marginalized communities; opening up producer markets in accordance with the purpose of creating new urban food strategies; supporting economic and physical access to affordable and healthy food via regulations and control; improving public health and food safety through education, monitoring and promoting healthy, seasonal local food and agroecological production; and generating food resilient

cities with enhanced rural- urban connections (Conaré, 2019; Hawkes and Halliday, 2017; Baker and de Zeeuw, 2015; Halliday, 2019; Moragues-Faus et al., 2013). Local governments from the same city/region or from completely different countries (like with the Milan Urban Food Policy Pact) also build alliances to share their experiences and construct common frameworks based on the above-mentioned tools and opportunities (Hawkes and Halliday, 2017; Vara-Sánchez et al., 2021).

It has been argued that the incorporation of values originating from food sovereignty to food policy can bring about a well-structured food system transformation (Kay et al., 2018). Implementing food sovereignty would require challenging the corporatist food system and market hegemony, questioning the systemic reasons of malnutrition and hunger, building solidarity and participatory democracy, using ecologically friendly practices that protect both the local people and biodiversity, supporting local scale production and reconnecting the rural with the urban (Clapp, 2014; European Coordination Vía Campesina, 2018; Nyeleni Newsletter No.35, 2018; Kay et al., 2018). Food sovereignty can also provide a new governance space in which policy-making processes could give rise to a re-connection of the state and society if discussion and deliberation in decision-making can be ensured (Kay et al., 2018; García-Sempere et al, 2018). A meaningful participation of various actors that goes beyond mere consultation could give the marginalized groups the right to be heard, so that they can gain the opportunity to have a say on the policies that directly have an impact on their lives. These dialogs can also elicit partnerships with peasants and other socioeconomic classes which were distant to each other before (Kay et al., 2018).

However, one needs to be cautious of the fact that public policies are merely instruments, and they are only able to bring equity and transformation to the current neoliberal agri-food system if they are built based on well-founded theories of democratic decision making and a social economic system that prioritizes well-being of the people and planet (Kay et al., 2018). Moragues-Faus and Battersby (2021) highlight, for instance, that systemic, multiscalar and relational perspectives need to be incorporated into the urban food policies to enable the transformative potential of urban food policymaking. Accordingly, adopting a systemic approach is essential, i.e., focusing on the network of actors, their connections, actions, motivations and the consequences of all these to people's right to food and the earth. Multiscalarity refers to the debates at different scales, that is, to the potentials of cross-scaling and alliance among various governance levels; and finally, relationality refers to actor variety and diverse ways of policymaking. Moreover, it has been asserted that urban food policies should be comprehended as ongoing, changeable, complicated and synergetic practices in which both civil and public actors have varied potentiality and dedication for reforming the food system (Vara-Sánchez et al., 2021).

Overall, the literature analyzing the transformative potential of local governments puts strong emphasis on participation of different stakeholders at different scales in food policy decision making, and a diverse set of food sovereignty principles such as producers supports and other mechanisms which give the control back to small-scale farmers, local ecological production, and network building. These mainly coincide with the dimensions mostly emphasized by the interviewees of the present study, as summarized in Section 5 (Results Section). However, before I present the results of the study, I will be presenting the methodology that I adopted in this study in Section 3 and introducing the case studies with their historical background.

3. METHODOLOGY

This study is based on the field research conducted between October 2021- December 2021, two additional field visits in May 2022 and July 2022; and participant observation carried out by working as a volunteer at a consumer cooperative in Istanbul between 2020- 2022. Using purposive sampling, we conducted eleven face-to-face semi-structured in-depth interviews with key actors. These key actors are comprised of four representatives of the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality who have leading roles in the making of agricultural and food policies in Istanbul and two representatives from the Izmir Metropolitan Municipality who take part in both policymaking and field data collection. In Izmir, two municipal government employees were interviewed together due to their shared responsibilities.

In addition, we conducted one interview with a scholar-activist, the founder and active member of a consumer food cooperative in Istanbul, two interviews with the heads of two different producer cooperatives in Izmir, who have been actively engaged in agricultural production for decades, and further interviews with two scholar-activists who work on food sovereignty in Turkey.

The full list of the eleven interviewees participating in this study is provided in Table 1. In order to maintain their anonymity, they were assigned specific codes. The interview questions were designed to understand the current municipal food and agriculture policies of the two municipal governments, the aspects of food policies stressed by their representatives, and their related plans for the future. The interviews with producer cooperative heads and scholar-activists focused on the past food and agriculture policies of the studied provinces and the strengths and shortcomings of the current agri-food policies of the recently elected municipalities. The interviews were audio-recorded, transcribed and later translated to English.

Furthermore, secondary data consisting of official and non- official municipal documents, websites and grey literature were also collected and analyzed. The incorporation of these o supported the refinement and contextualization of the primary data.

Table 3.1. List of interviewees.

Interviewee city	Role	Code
Istanbul	Representative from the Agriculture and Fisheries Department of Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality	IST1
Istanbul	Representative from the Istanbul Planning Agency Vision 2050 Office	IST2
Istanbul	Representative from the Istanbul Planning Agency Vision 2050 Office	IST3
Istanbul	Advisor to ISYÖN and representative from the Department of Agriculture of Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality	IST4
Istanbul	Consumer Cooperative Founder & Scholar-activist	IST5
Izmir	Representative from the Agricultural Services Department of Izmir Metropolitan Municipality	IZM1
Izmir	Representative from the Agricultural Services Department of Izmir Metropolitan Municipality	IZM2
Izmir	Former Head of an Agricultural Development Cooperative in İzmir	IZM3
Izmir	Head of an Agricultural Development Cooperative in Izmir	IZM4
Istanbul	Scholar-activist working on food sovereignty in Turkey	ACA1
İzmir	Scholar-activist working on food sovereignty in Turkey	ACA2

4. FOOD POLICY IN ISTANBUL VERSUS IZMIR: A TALE OF TWO CITIES

This section introduces the cases of Istanbul and Izmir with respect to their agricultural and food related policies and briefly explores their historical backgrounds. In particular, the current food policies of the two municipalities are summarized with respect to their main governing bodies, strategic processes and main projects implemented so far.

4.1. Introduction to the case studies

To investigate the potentials of metropolitan municipalities in terms of transformative food policy making and food security and food sovereignty in Turkey, I selected Istanbul and Izmir, the first and third most crowded cities of Turkey, respectively, as case studies. This choice was mainly based on the fact that Istanbul and Izmir both have newly elected local governments with open statements regarding their ambitions to give a fresh impetus to local food policies[7,8]. These metropolitan cities constitute two very interesting cases in terms of their historically differential levels of agricultural production, their varying levels of emphasis on food security and food sovereignty discourses, and their potential to unlock similar political responses in different municipalities of Turkey by becoming a role model for food policy making. As such, I believe these cases are very fruitful for a comparative analysis specifically pertaining to the transformative potential of municipal food policies in Turkey.

Istanbul is a metropolitan municipality located at the north-west of Turkey (Figure 4.1) with an area of 5,000 km^2 and it is the most crowded city of Turkey with a population of almost 16 million residents[9]. Izmir is the third most crowded city of Turkey which is situated on the western region, one side surrounded with the Aegean Sea (Figure 4.1). Compared to Istanbul, Izmir's population is nearly one fourth while the agricultural areas are twice as much. Both cities have pivotal roles in Turkey's economy with completely different rankings in shares of agricultural production in the national GDP[7]. Although both cities' food policies seem similar at first sight, they differ from each other in the contexts of their opportunities, challenges and characteristics in terms of food and agricultural

[7] https://www.ibb.istanbul/arsiv/35967/imamoglu-ibb-tarim-uretimini-desteklemede-bir
[8] https://www.izmir.bel.tr/tr/Haberler/turkiye-nin-tarim-politikalarini-izmir-sekillendirecek/40784/156
[9] https://biruni.tuik.gov.tr/bolgeselistatistik/anaSayfa.do?dil=en#

policies. These differences and similarities make them convenient to conduct a comparative study regarding their food policies.



Figure 4.1. Location of the case studies: Istanbul and Izmir in Turkey (Prepared in mapchart.net)

Table 4.1. City characteristics and agricultural capacities of Istanbul and Izmir. Data are drawn from Turkish Statistical Institute.

	Istanbul	**Izmir**
Population (2021)	15,840,900	4,425,789
Acreage	5,000 km^2	12,000 km^2
Agricultural acreage per cent	14%	30%
Agricultural acreage	75,000 hectares	343,300 hectares
Agricultural production (2019)	2.093.703.000 TL	19.915.789.223 TL
Rank in share of agriculture in the GDP (2019)	63rd	3rd
Farmer number according to farmer registration system (2022)	4,000[10]	50,000[11]
Number of chambers of agriculture	9	20
Number of agricultural cooperatives	30+	287
Budget for agricultural subsidies (2021)	38 million TL (total budget 45 million TL)	68 million TL (estimated budget for 2022, 97 million TL)
Total municipal budget (2022)	43.6 billion TL[12]	12.5 billion TL[13]

[10] https://www.tarimorman.gov.tr/SGB/TARYAT/Belgeler/il_yatirim_rehberleri/istanbul.pdf
[11] https://www.tarimorman.gov.tr/SGB/TARYAT/Belgeler/il_yatirim_rehberleri/izmir.pdf
[12] https://www.cumhuriyet.com.tr/siyaset/imamoglu-2022-butcesini-acikladi-bu-sehrin-kimsesizlerine-umut-olmaya-devam-edecegiz-1887719
[13] https://www.cumhuriyet.com.tr/turkiye/izmir-buyuksehir-belediyesinin-2022-butcesi-125-milyar-tl-1884428

4.2. Background: Understanding food policies and provision in the context of Turkey

Looking from a historical perspective, nation-scale food policies had been existing in the Ottoman Empire period. The empire was close to having self-sufficiency on a considerable number of essential agricultural products that were important for the national economic growth; and growing food for exportation purposes was discouraged. Fear of scarcity was more dominant than accumulating wealth or sustaining a positive trade balance. Furthermore, alleviating the ongoing problems of food scarcity and taking preventive measures against it were seen as the duties of the empire. Hence, in the Ottoman economy, the allocation of food was strictly monitored (Murphey, 1987).

Currently, in the Republican Turkey, Ministries of Treasury, Trade, and Agriculture and Forestry are the primary responsible parties for regulating the rules and procedures of food provision. In addition to the related ministries, metropolitan municipalities also have the authority and responsibility for food provision as the local governments (Greenpeace Turkey, 2019). In accordance with the current regulations[14], the central element of food provision and trade in Turkey is wholesale food markets or "hal", the fruit and vegetable wholesale warehouse, which are regulated within the jurisdiction of local municipalities (Greenpeace Turkey, 2019; Kaldjian, 2003). "The law of hals", the regulation governing the fruit and vegetable wholesale warehouses, adopted in 2010, was supposed to lower the food prices by at least 25% and bring a food identity system to keep the records of the production and trade of vegetables and fruits (Kaldjian, 2003)[15]. However, the privileges and the price setting power given to the supermarkets have resulted in the loss of competition and emergence of price speculations which benefited a few big producers and buyers, forming an oligopolistic market (Kaldjian, 2003)[13,16].

According to the Article 7 of the Metropolitan Municipality Law No. 5216, the municipalities are responsible for making, operating, licensing and inspecting hals. The authority and responsibility within the municipality rests with the Hal Directorate[17]. According to the statements of the authorities from this directorate, approximately 60 percent of the fruit and vegetable trade in Istanbul takes place outside the market system. Parallel to the increase in the number of supermarket chains, the food supply system outside the wholesale market has been increasing (Greenpeace Turkey, 2019).

[14] http://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/eskiler/2010/03/20100326-1.htm
[15] https://www.dunya.com/kose-yazisi/hal-yasasi-degisince-meyve-ve-sebze-ucuzlar-mi/430007
[16] https://www.karasaban.net/hal-yasasi-ne-getirecek/
[17] https://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/eskiler/2004/07/20040723.htm#1

Even though the municipal organizations can be traced back to the Ottoman Empire era, the metropolitan municipalities do not have a longstanding history in Turkey. The establishment of metropolitan municipalities was not enacted until the 1980s (Yemen, 2017). There are now two levels of local governments in terms of municipalities: metropolitan municipality itself and district municipalities as their sub-tier local governments (Yetiskul et al., 2021). Recently, two laws have been passed related with the inclusion of the rural areas within provinces in 2004 (Law No. 5216) and 2012 (Law No. 6360) which changed the borders of Istanbul and Izmir with respect to their provincial borders, respectively (Yemen, 2017; Kızılboğa and Alıcı, 2013). This border change resulted in a change of the status of villages: they became first urban neighborhoods and then rural neighborhoods in 2020 with an annexed law to 5216 (Law No. 7254), which meant that provinces became responsible for rural regions where inhabitants' livelihoods are based still on farming (Yetiskul et al., 2021).

4.3. The case of Istanbul

Being the most crowded city in Europe and the fifth largest metropolitan city in the world, Istanbul has more than 16 million inhabitants as of 2021, equivalent to one fifth of Turkey's population (Istanbul Food Strategy, 2021; Greenpeace Turkey, 2020). On the other hand, Istanbul has a very limited agricultural area covering only 14% of its acreage, which corresponds to 750 km^2 and ranks 63rd among 81 cities in Turkey in terms of generated value added of agricultural production in 2019[18,19]. After the 1980 coup d'état, the agricultural capacity of Istanbul has declined due to the extensive urban sprawl on the fertile agricultural lands in its hinterland (Turkkan, 2018). Accelerated urbanization, deregulated environmental planning, the relocation of industries from the city center to peripheries and the impacts of climate change have resulted in immense pressures on rural areas and the loss of agricultural land, forests and water basins (Istanbul Food Strategy, 2021; Greenpeace Turkey, 2019).

Even before the decline in the agricultural potential, Istanbul had never been able to feed itself since the Ottoman Empire period (Istanbul Food Strategy, 2021). It was a "consumption center" in this era, as it is today and the grain necessity was mainly met from Ukraine, Thrace and the Egyptian delta (Murphey, 1987). The production of food and transportation of water for the city's residents has always been a matter of survival both in the Byzantine and Ottoman Empire periods (Istanbul Food Strategy, 2021). In terms of food governance, the governing bodies cared for the livelihoods of their

[18] https://biruni.tuik.gov.tr/bolgeselistatistik/anaSayfa.do?dil=en#
[19] https://www.tarimorman.gov.tr/SGB/TARYAT/Belgeler/il_yatirim_rehberleri/istanbul.pdf

underprivileged citizens, and the benefits of the royal family members came after protecting the interests of their people. This was implemented as proposing complete or partial reduction in taxes in hard times and allocating the resources between advantageous and less advantageous regions in abundance (Murphey, 1987).

The urban agricultural lands, bostans, in Istanbul have also been dramatically decreasing from the second half of the twentieth century onwards, despite once being an inherent part of fruit and vegetable provision to the city (Kaldjian, 2003). Although urban agriculture is often perceived as a concept advancing food security for low-income people living in the city, it does not necessarily imply that urban individuals are made food secure through urban agriculture (Ellis and Sumberg, 1998). Indeed, Istanbul's economically disadvantaged inhabitants often depend on receiving food from their rural acquaintances from where they had migrated. In fact, accessibility of arable areas in urban context is very limited, particularly, for low-income individuals (Kaldjian, 2003).

Today, food provision in Istanbul constitutes a large economy with various products and multiple actors in which products that come from all over the country and from abroad are transported, processed, consumed and distributed (Greenpeace Turkey, 2020). In accordance with legal regulations explained in the previous section, wholesale food sales in Istanbul occurs through hals which operate as a depot and a wholesale market. Fresh food mainly comes from the Aegean and Mediterranean regions. The retail sales of food takes place by means of formal channels such as chain supermarkets, local stores called bakkals and manavs, and "neighborhood bazaar"s opening on a weekly basis and informal channels like street vendors (Kaldjian, 2003). The urban sprawl in Istanbul has changed the dynamics of food consumption patterns as well as its provision in the 21st century. These changes have led to an absolute vanishing, downsizing or decline in the number of food supplying components such as informal bazaar dealers and bostancıs, and sales places such as manavs and neighborhood bazaars. Those who could spatially and economically endure these changes had to comply with the increased competition in food provisioning. As a result, Istanbul's connection with food was reshaped substantially (Turkkan, 2018).

In 2019, a new metropolitan municipal government for Istanbul was elected in the local elections[20]. This new municipal government incorporated agricultural and food policies to its agenda. In February 2020, the municipal government established the Istanbul Planning Agency as a data collecting and social policy developing science-based organ, which includes an institute, a statistics

[20] https://www.dw.com/tr/ibb-başkanı-imamoğlu-mazbatasını-aldı/a-49381248

office, a social policy office and a research component generating policy suggestions based on Sustainable Development Goals, called the Vision 2050 Office[21]. In December 2020, Istanbul municipality representatives signed the Glasgow Food and Climate Declaration which aims to build sustainable food systems compatible with the fight against climate crisis[22]. In September 2021, the metropolitan municipality in Istanbul (IBB) published the draft version of Istanbul Food Strategy document to collect the view and suggestions of Istanbulites, NGOs, producer and consumer organizations, trade associations and academia. The final version of this document is yet to be published officially. Finally, the full membership process at the Milan Urban Food Policy Pact is currently in the final stage for Istanbul (Istanbul Food Strategy, 2021).

In addition to the strategy development processes and participation in international pacts, Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality is currently focusing on supporting local food policies by setting up producer and peasant markets, free-of-charge milk distribution to children of poor households, supporting producer unions, cooperatives and chambers of agriculture via providing seed, seedling, fertilizer, pesticide, animal feed, machinery and equipment and training[23]. The support for producers is not provided individually, but instead, through producer cooperatives so as to enable farmers to organize under producer cooperatives[24]. In addition to the small number of agricultural development cooperatives (around 30 in number as articulated by interviewee IST1), there are 9 chambers of agriculture in Istanbul[25]. (See Table 4.2 for a summary)

4.4. The case of Izmir

With a population of about 4.5 million[26], Izmir is the third most crowded city in Turkey (Yetiskul et al, 2021). Izmir's agricultural area corresponds to 27% of its total acreage with 3.255 km^2 and comes in 3rd among 81 cities in the value of agricultural production in 2019[27,28]. Its hinterland is comprised of forests and mountains, coastal settlements with seasonally higher population and agricultural areas with considerably lower population (Yetiskul et al, 2021). There are 279 agricultural producer cooperatives and 20 chambers of agriculture in Izmir[29,30].

[21] https://ipa.istanbul/en/about-ipa/
[22] https://twitter.com/imamoglu_int/status/1338538974831374336?lang=en
[23] https://tarim.ibb.istanbul/img/9312914102021__5765344500m.pdf
[24] https://www.ibb.istanbul/arsiv/36521/ciftcilere-ibb-destegi-kooperatifler-uzerinde
[25] https://www.tzob.org.tr
[26] https://data.tuik.gov.tr/Bulten/Index?p=Adrese-Dayali-Nufus-Kayit-Sistemi-Sonuclari-2020-37210
[27] https://biruni.tuik.gov.tr/bolgeselistatistik/anaSayfa.do?dil=en#
[28] https://www.tarimorman.gov.tr/SGB/TARYAT/Belgeler/il_yatirim_rehberleri/izmir.pdf
[29] https://izmir.tarimorman.gov.tr/Belgeler/İl%20Müdürlüğü%20Brifing.pdf
[30] https://www.tzob.org.tr

In the Ottoman Empire period, Izmir was one of the principal ports for foreign trade and agriculture globally connected with Western European markets after the installment of railways (Demirci and Coşar, 2021; Yetiskul et al, 2021; Frangakis, 1985). This international connection also gave rise to an increase of land used for agricultural production as a result of improved economic connections to the global market (Demirci and Coşar, 2021). Izmir gained attraction as an international port such that many merchant houses and consulates of various European countries and the US were established starting from the mid-1800s (Demirci and Coşar, 2021). Positioned as the fruit and grain supplier of Istanbul, Izmir's economy grew substantially in the 1600s and the end of 1800s (Küçükkalay, 2008).

In the Republican era, at the end of the 1970s, Izmir Municipality developed a project led by the then-mayor Ihsan Alyanak for selling staples at a municipality-owned modern retail store (Koç and Koç, 1999; Tekeli, 2018). Products such as fruits, vegetables, meat and coal were sold there for quite low prices (Koç and Koç, 1999). After Ihsan Alyanak, the elected mayor Burhan Özfatura turned these stores into chain markets and increased their number from 28 to 65 in 1989. However, it was also the same mayor that took the lead in the privatization of these stores and caused the collapse of this project in his re-election period (Tekeli, 2018). The implementation of neoliberal agriculture and food policies supporting exports and free trade after the 1970s gave rise to Izmir's involvement in the global trade, and eventually, Izmir secured its position as an organic agricultural producer and exporter in the 2000s (Özatağan and Karakaya Ayalp, 2021). All these political and economic deregulations encompassed depeasantization, loss of agricultural areas and finally public protests against the dispossession of arable lands for energy related projects (ibid.).

Similar to Istanbul, Izmir is currently suffering from intense urbanization, but the agricultural production has been continuing thanks to its vast hinterland (Özatağan and Karakaya Ayalp, 2021). In contrast to Istanbul, where support to local food policies is rather new, supporting the agricultural cooperatives, rural capacity building and agri-food projects has been an essential policy for Izmir since 2004, starting with the then-mayor Aziz Kocaoğlu (Yetiskul et al, 2021)[31]. Before the extension of its territories to the provincial border in 2012, Izmir Metropolitan Municipality (IZBB) had already established its Department of Agriculture, Parks and Gardens in 2007 and became the first municipality to include its hinterland to its political agenda under the then mayor of Aziz Kocaoğlu (Yetiskul et al, 2021). Izmir has always been an important actor in agricultural production in Turkey and developed export-based agricultural and economic strategies. Izmir has recently started to

[31] https://www.birgun.net/haber/turkiye-tarimda-izmir-modeli-ni-ornek-almali-222357

develop novel strategies including new perspectives on agricultural operations that are alternative to the dominant industrial agricultural production practices (Özatağan and Karakaya Ayalp, 2021).

The food policies of the newly elected metropolitan municipal government in Izmir in 2019 share similarities with the food policies of the municipal government of Istanbul. The municipality of Izmir organizes its food policies under the motto "Another Agriculture is Possible" focusing on building producer and ecological markets, and a seed center; free-of-charge milk distribution to poor-household children; opening up of its own grocery stores as municipal subsidiaries, supporting producer unions, cooperatives and chambers of agriculture via providing seed, seedling, fertilizer, pesticide, animal feed, machinery and equipment and training; establishing an entrepreneurship center and waste management facilities[32]. In addition, Izmir Agriculture Development Center was founded to tackle the impacts of climate change on agricultural production and inform the society about the relevant sustainable agricultural practices[33] (See Table 4.2 for a summary).

[32] https://www.izmir.bel.tr/tr/HaberArsivi/157
[33] http://iztam.com/hakkimizda/

Table 4.2. A list of main governing bodies, strategic processes and policy actions in terms of food policies in Istanbul and Izmir.

	Istanbul	**Izmir**
Governing bodies	Department of Agricultural Services	Department of Agricultural Services
	Istanbul Planning Agency	-
	Municipal Council	Municipal Council
Strategic processes	Development of a Municipal Food Strategy	"Another Agriculture is Possible" Project
	Istanbul Planning Agency	-
	Diagnostic processes and strategic planning workshops	Diagnostic processes and strategic planning workshops
Policy Actions	People's Milk (*Halk Süt*)	Milk Lamb (*Süt Kuzusu*)
	People's Grocery (*Halk Bakkal*)	People's Grocery (*Halkın Bakkalı*)
	Producer markets and peasant markets	Producer markets and ecological markets
	Upcoming project: Seed depot	Seed centers
	Supports to producer unions, cooperatives and chambers of agriculture	Supports to producer unions, cooperatives and chambers of agriculture
	Marketing support to producer organizations (allocating a direct sales space in producer markets)	Marketing support to producer organizations (allocating a space in producer markets, specific marketing support for branding)
	Recycling of food waste (upcoming project)	Compost production, wastewater treatment projects
	-	Entrepreneurship Center
	-	Izmir Agricultural Development Center

5. RESULTS

This section focuses on the analysis of novel food policies of the Istanbul and Izmir metropolitan municipalities after the local elections in 2019 and how these new local governments address the agriculture and food issues and what they stress in the developed policies. The below results are drawn from the fieldwork carried out in 2021 and 2022 entailing 11 semi-structured interviews (5 in Istanbul, 4 in Izmir and 2 scholar-activists working on food sovereignty in Turkey).

The overall picture from the data we collected shows that two metropolitan municipalities have commonalities as well as differences in terms of their food and agriculture policies as well as their agricultural production potential. Izmir's vast hinterland, high agricultural potential and previous experiences on providing producer supports enables it to target and implement policies targeting economic growth, rural development, enhancing producer welfare and consumer access. While implementing quite similar food policy actions to Izmir, Istanbul's very limited agricultural areas and high consumption intensity are translated as a food policy mainly focusing on endorsements for farmers to ensure they do not quit farming and on food security for a massive number of consumers living in Istanbul. In other words, although the food policies largely seem to overlap, the physical differences mentioned above lead to different target areas.

The specific dimensions focused below in detail are food governance strategies and policies, participation and democratization efforts, endorsements for ecological production, perspectives on contract farming, theoretical and technical efforts of subunits, national and international network building, expectations regarding the economic returns to agriculture, food- and agriculture-related data availability, ability to feed the city's residents and food security and food sovereignty discourses and practices adopted by two municipalities (See Table 5.1 for a summary). These dimensions were mainly selected based on the literature reviewed as well as from the interviews conducted.

5.1. Food governance strategies and main policies

There are shared features of Istanbul and Izmir in terms of food policies and different physical conditions affecting the making of these policies. Firstly, both in Istanbul and Izmir, small holders are dominating in agriculture, that is, the plots of lands are often small. For Istanbul and Izmir this is explained as follows:

> "When we look at the producers and the [agricultural] land [structure], we see that [the amount of agricultural land in] Istanbul is limited, it is not a market that large producers penetrate, and the ownership structure is complex and based on small holders. Big entrepreneurs would most likely prefer other places like Manisa, for instance, to invest, instead of Istanbul." (IST3, IBB representative, 2021)

> "In İzmir, land suitable for agricultural production is not as much as one would think. There are no large plots of lands for agricultural production. The [agricultural] land is scattered, the parcels are small, and the producers which are mostly small-scale ones cannot earn enough to invest in themselves because they produce in small areas." (IZM1, IZBB representative, 2021)

In both Istanbul and Izmir, the interviewees representing the municipalities stated that the subsidies and projects are mainly targeting the needs of small-scale producers. Producer organizations are supported and there is a close relationship with the producers, producer cooperatives and chambers of agriculture in both municipalities. The main goal of the municipalities is creating long-term, permanent policies which would not be changed each time the ruling party or the mayor changes.

> "The producers in Istanbul are mostly small-scale, and we support small and medium-sized producers. Women producers and cooperatives are prioritized" (IST4, IBB representative, 2021)

> "The municipality carries out activities such as [free-of-charge] distribution of seedling, fertilizer, machinery and equipment distribution and training to improve agriculture and redevelopment of farming in the peri-urban areas. These actions of the municipality are going better than others. We also talk to many farmers who come to the producer market, and they especially say that the distribution of seedlings, seeds, fertilizers relieve them of a significant financial burden." (IST5, consumer cooperative representative and scholar-activist in Istanbul, 2022)

Izmir's long history related with producer cooperative supports differentiates it from other provinces in Turkey. The current food policies and supports stem from this past:

> "Izmir Metropolitan Municipality has a unique and traditional approach to the cooperative movement and agriculture in Turkey that originates from the past [experiences]." (IZM3, producer cooperative representative in İzmir, 2022)

> "When we compare Izmir and Istanbul, Izmir unquestionably surpasses Istanbul in terms of municipalism. For years, cooperatives have developed and grown there. For example, İzmir buys products from cooperatives for all the subsidiaries of the municipality and does its best for the

> existence, survival and growth of cooperatives." (IST5, consumer cooperative representative and scholar-activist in Istanbul, 2022)

Currently, IBB does not provide public transportation support for the consumers to reach both of its producer markets in Kadıköy and Beşiktaş (presumably because these are already well-connected destinations), while IZBB now re-continues its support for consumers after a short break during the first restrictions of the pandemic, for its producer markets in Pagos and Bergama. For the producers, transportation of the agricultural products is a heavy burden, however, that kind of support is not provided by IBB, and IZBB discontinued its transportation support for producers in the COVID-19 pandemic.

Another similarity of the municipal governments of Istanbul and Izmir is the ambition and endeavor to shorten the supply chain. This endeavor arises from the target of eliminating the intermediaries in the supply chain such that producers are able to sell their products at a fair price for both producers and consumers. However, there is also the insight that merely reducing the number of the actors in the supply chain does not guarantee a better food system:

> "Food is a costly item even if we remove the intermediaries, and the elimination of them does not necessarily mean that the consumer has access to healthy food." (IST3, IBB representative, 2021)

Representatives from IBB explain that it is the first time that the municipal government in Istanbul tries to take a holistic approach to the food-related issues, and hence, the municipality is at the very beginning of the process to develop and implement novel policies. Therefore, they are at a phase where they are constantly evaluating the outcomes of the implemented policies and the responses of producers to these policies. Accordingly, the main target is to prevent the producers from giving up producing due to financial reasons and protect the limited amount of agricultural lands from the uncontrolled urban transformation in Istanbul.

Izmir Metropolitan Municipality (IZBB) has organized "Public's Grocery" (Halkın Bakkalı in Turkish) as a place to sell both fresh vegetables and fruits and products of the cooperatives. The producers who sell their products to the "Public's Grocery" are able to receive their payments almost immediately. Apart from visiting the stores physically, the consumers can shop online as well (https://www.halkinbakkali.com/). In the producer markets, the wholesale market prices are set as the upper limit for the products by the municipality. There are two separate marketplaces targeting only ecological farmers to open booths (in Bostanlı on Fridays and Balçova on Tuesdays), whereas the

producer markets in Istanbul do not directly target ecological production, but instead, small-scale producers and their cooperatives, regardless of the production technique. IBB has recently set up an e-commerce webpage for its Public's Grocery, too (https://www.halkmarket.istanbul/).



Figure 5.1. Producer and cooperative market in Kadıköy, Istanbul (Source: IBB News Archive[34])



Figure 5.2. Producer and cooperative market in Kültürpark, Izmir (Source: Yeşil Gazete[35])

[34] https://www.ibb.istanbul/arsiv/37010/uretici-vatandas-35-senedir-boyle-bir-hak-gor
[35] https://yesilgazete.org/kulturpark-yok-ediliyor/

5.2. Participation and democratization efforts

In both municipalities, close ties are said to be retained with the producers, producer cooperatives and chambers of agriculture, however, some of our interviewees underlined that their participation remains merely at the opinion provision and suggestion levels in both municipalities, and they are not really accounted for in the execution stage:

> "We usually organize workshops at the beginning of big projects. In those workshops, we gather all sector representatives at the same table. We gather the producers, industrialists, NGOs and universities at the same table and tell them: 'We have this kind of plan, what are the contributions you can make, let's get your thoughts'. We make sure we get everybody involved." (IZM1, IZBB representative, 2021)

> "Participation takes place in the public opinion formation and survey phase, but not in the execution phase. There is a goal of implementing participation in the planning phase, but this is participatory planning and participation is still not achieved in the execution phase in this case. Different actors may take part in the assessment phase, but this is the most primitive form of participation. This is not specific to food-related issues, it is like this for everything." (IST3, IBB representative, 2021)

Another representative from Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality takes a different viewpoint about the participation mechanisms by emphasizing their own efforts towards inclusion and deliberation:

> "We try to take decisions with relevant subjects [stakeholders] as much as possible. Our team is against the 'decision-making on behalf of people' approach that has been used in agriculture so far. All the people in our team are here for a purpose, not simply to be a part of the municipality." (IST4, IBB representative, 2021)

Similar to Istanbul, there are counter-discourses in Izmir concerning the presence of deliberative spaces and governance structures:

> "Farmers cannot participate; rather, the Agriculture Department and consultants from the academia try to implement Tunç Soyer's vision. The consumers and farmers have no saying/authority in decision-making." (ACA2, Scholar- activist in Izmir, 2022)

The inclusiveness and level of participation for the preparation of the Food Strategy Document of Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality has also been questioned by one of our interviewees. One of the main points raised is related with the absence of civil society in the preparation of this document and the practical display of the municipality's democracy perception upon this document. Another reflected discrepancy is the (non-)continuation of the document and the actors involved afterwards. Furthermore, there are hesitations regarding the components of the Food Council and its capacity to advocate an equitable food system:

> "The development of a food strategy document by the new local government and the inclusion of consumer initiatives can be seen as a first step. But in terms of giving the initiative to the society, the process is actually top-down. İBB has decided on a strategy and is going to implement it, the subject seems to be the IBB [itself]. There is a problem regarding how to reverse this." (ACA2, Scholar- activist, 2022)

> "The municipality published a food strategy document, they were developing it through IPA, but then they started doing it with TEPAV (Economic Policy Research Foundation of Turkey). TEPAV is an association representing the sovereigns and there is no mechanism to solve people's food problem with them [sovereigns]. The food strategy document stagnated. The issue we cared about the most was the formation of the Food Council, and they appointed [also] industry representatives there. There are several [other] components, but it also contains industry representatives. [Making a] food policy for the people is not quite possible if industry representatives are present. Therefore, I think that the municipality does some of the work just for the sake of doing it." (IST5, consumer cooperative representative and scholar-activist in Istanbul, 2022)

When we look at the consumer side, the consumers show a weak presence in the development of projects and urban food policies. A deliberative governance space for consumers to raise their voices and participate in the decision-making processes related with the making of agri-food policies is lacking. This situation is explained as follows for Istanbul:

> "We receive a small fraction of consumer behavior and demands as a reflection [feedback]. There is often a process in which producers and the consumers transform each other. Producers and cooperatives participate in the decision-making process, but the consumers are not there because we do not have such a connection with them. We have just started to practice a participation mechanism for consumers in the decision-making process via monthly events organized by the Market Commission." (IST4, IBB representative, 2021)

In Izmir, the absence of consumers in decision-making is evident as well. Consumers can reach the local government through the Citizen Communication Center (CCC) by asking their questions or expressing their complaints using this online tool. However, their participation is merely limited to this tool or a visit to talk to the local government representatives.

The prices in the producer markets of Istanbul are said to be determined by the Market Commission which is comprised of producers elected by other producers participating in the markets (Currently, the Market Commission is consisting of representatives from the Göçbeyli Producer Coop, Koçulu Cheese Production, and Refikler Farm, according to our interviewee IST5). However, the Market Commission's functionality, decision-making power and the ability to represent the needs of producers is currently not clear:

> "There is a Market Commission, but it doesn't work very well, maybe it should be made operational and the problems that arise in the [producer] market should be solved immediately by negotiating with the ISYÖN[36] [municipality's subsidiary] management. We have difficulties to access the relevant people [who are responsible and have authority for the running of producer markets]. This structure [i.e. the Market Commission] does not have any ownership and does not see itself as an active subject. The decisions related with the producer market has always been top-down and no one asked the Market Commission to work on something. How do you become an active subject when this is the case?" (IST5, consumer cooperative representative and scholar-activist in Istanbul, 2022)

5.3. Ecological production efforts

There are efforts towards changing the dominant unsustainable farming practices in Istanbul, but the transition is not forced by IBB. Instead, IBB continues to provide hybrid seedling to farmers, but in the meantime, they inform farmers about local seeds and test producing these seedlings in pilot projects run by IBB. However no direct subsidies are provided to growers practicing ecological farming methods, nor to women in agriculture. IBB representatives state that they aim to support farmers so that they continue production, yet, the IBB does not have any economic targets like increasing production level of Istanbul or agricultural exports, in contrast to IZBB:

[36] Istanbul Management Renewal Inc. is affiliated to the Special Provincial Administration. It carries out the operation of Gürpınar Fishery Market, IMM sacrificial areas, the lifeguard services on Istanbul beaches, district markets (Kadıköy Historical Tuesday Market, Beşiktaş Ulus High Society Market), the production of vegetable seedlings and the trade of fishery products. As a new field of activity, the e-commerce system of İBB Halk Market has been set up.

> "If a small-scale ecological producer comes to İBB, we provide compensation for the loss of efficiency [as a result of ecological production in contrast to conventional farming] by giving them priority for the presence in the producer market and bringing their products directly to consumers. When the intermediaries are eliminated, the loss of efficiency can be tolerated with the [increased] price [that is directly received by the farmer instead of intermediaries]." (IST4, IBB representative, 2021)

Some intended projects to support ecological farming in both municipalities could not be realized due to undeclared reasons and this stumbling was not very welcomed on the side of food sovereignty advocates both in Istanbul and Izmir, especially the action plans related with agroecological production:

> "They [IBB] said they were going to practice soil analysis. For this, a controlled process was going to be operated. Unfortunately, they could not do much analysis this year, however, soil and water analysis are important in order to differentiate between those who have started ecological farming and those who have not." (IST5, consumer cooperative representative and scholar-activist in Istanbul, 2022)

> "If we are talking about food sovereignty, the connection with ecology is indispensable, and agroecology is at the center of this. When we look at the actions [of IZBB] towards this, we do not see anything worthwhile. Good agriculture and organic agriculture are occasionally supported, but these are not the main focus of the agroecological perspective, rather, they are being criticized [by agroecology.advocates]" (ACA2, Scholar- activist in Izmir, 2022)

Izmir Metropolitan Municipality puts a particular emphasis on the agriculture in Izmir. Unlike Istanbul, Izmir has a longer history of agricultural subsidies, producer cooperatives and food policies developed by the local government and these experiences manifest themselves as having more experience with technical information and product knowledge. The agricultural and food related departments of the current IZBB government consists of people who know Izmir's different regions and their specific problems well and they continually perform field research. These features of Izmir are expressed by a representative of IZBB as follows:

> "The process of cooperativization took place in Izmir starting from the Republican period. Therefore, we encounter the first and strongest examples of producer cooperatives here." (IZM1, IZBB representative, 2021)

> "Izmir Metropolitan Municipality already had a movement that focused on agriculture, especially since the period of Aziz Kocaoğlu [the previous mayor], but Tunç Soyer [the current mayor] took it to the next level. He has started 'Another Agriculture is Possible' policy. While eliminating the problems in the existing structures, there are also efforts to protect the producers and to deliver healthy products to consumers." (IZM2, IZBB representative, 2021)

New local government of Izmir insists on the utilization of the local seeds. Accordingly, scientific studies are carried out to improve the old seeds in the Seed Center and prepare them for today's climatic conditions. IBB is also in the process of building a Seed Depot with projects such as testing local seeds for different climatic conditions and for an investigation of whether these are authentically local, and IBB wants to expand such projects related with seeds to primary and secondary school students.

5.4. Contract farming

Contract farming is a practice often implemented by large agribusinesses upon small-scale farmers by imposing certain quality- and quantity-related standards, which farmers are obliged to meet in order to sell their products. This takes away the control of farmers over their own production methods and products and turns farmers into wage laborers and leads to a loss of their agencies, contradicting food sovereignty principles severely (Al, 2020). Hence, the adoption of contract farming could potentially carry the same risks when imposed by municipalities. Therefore, one question I asked during the interviews was directly related with these concerns.

Indeed, one IBB representative stated that IBB does not endorse contract farming based on ideological grounds and does not apply it at all. In contrast, IZBB representatives asserted that contract farming can be applied in a way as to benefit farmers in form of a sales guarantee reducing financial risks for small-scale farmers. IZBB announces the price list of the products to be bought by the municipality, and the prices are often 2-3 folds of the market price, and the producers can grow as they want provided that they pay attention to the cost of producing that product:

> "We have not done any contract production and we are against it ideologically, but this does not mean that we will not do it in the future. For example, it can be something like making a contract for the eggs obtained from the chicken project and distributing them to the Public's Grocers. However, this must not be done in the form of imposition as done in [the mainstream agribusiness-based] contract farming, but instead, it could be done in form of a joint-decision [by farmers and the municipality] on a non-profit basis to distribute the profit [to farmers]" (IST4, IBB representative, 2021)

In İzmir, the procurement process is undertaken by one of the companies of the IZBB called BAYSAN[37]. Accordingly, the benefits of this type of contract farming between farmers and the municipality is as follows:

> "In this way, the producers earn a good amount of money and can continue their businesses." (IZM1, IZBB representative, 2021)

5.5. Theoretical and technical efforts

Representatives from both Istanbul and Izmir Metropolitan Municipalities acknowledged the importance of accessing and generating reliable agri-food data as well as practical and theoretical insights to be able to do agricultural planning and take decisions based on them. To this end, Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality has been collecting the data it needs for policy making via the Istanbul Planning Agency since its establishment in 2020. This agency has become a scientific hub to produce data and develop policy proposals and provides a space for Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality to create collective thinking in a multistakeholder manner. This hub is also said to be convenient for keeping up to date with academic discussions and practice new participatory mechanisms.

Izmir Metropolitan Municipality has established an agriculture and research &development center called Izmir Agricultural Development Center in 2021. Within this center, there are experiments on agriculture without soil, vertical farming, carbon capture and storage based on drought scenarios and infiltration basins as climate crisis solutions. The purpose is to perform those experiments for all the provinces of Turkey and be an apostle in the technological and innovative practices in agriculture and bring about automatization in agriculture:

> "We are the pioneers in Turkey in this regard. In addition to being the first agricultural services department, we are one of the municipalities that produce the highest number of projects, share the project results the most and expand the application areas." (IZM1, IZBB representative, 2021)

[37] BAYSAN was established in 1984 in the Bayındır district of İzmir with the cooperation of the state and civil society. The company continued operating until 2000s, then it was transferred to Izmir Metropolitan Municipality after the closure of Izmir Special Provincial Administration. With the mission of "Sustainable Agriculture, Healthy Food and Happy Farmers in İzmir", it continues its activities by establishing a research center for product planning, opening educational institutions, creating markets, branding and establishing facilities in line with this purpose.

Yet, some of these efforts are sometimes criticized by the civil society, in particular, by Çiftçi-Sen and scholar-activists, as being techno-fixes based on corporate agri-business model (Çobanoğlu, 2020)[38]. This point has been raised by the interviewee ACA2 (Scholar- activist in Izmir) as well (As this argument was linked to the food sovereignty discourse, we provide this statement under 5.10 in detail).

5.6. Access to agriculture- and food-related data

The biggest hurdle in the way of both municipalities is stated by municipality representatives as the difficulties of reaching accurate data related with the food system:

> "The lack of data is a great challenge; we are obliged to produce these by ourselves." (IST3, IBB representative, 2021)

> "The most compelling thing is accessing the data. It is not possible to obtain reliable data from the wholesale market registration system and farmer registration system, and the systems do not talk to each other. It is necessary to go to the field and create the data [ourselves]. We have collected qualitative and quantitative data from the Turkish Statistical Institute, agriculture and trade provincial directorates, software companies, academia, the business world and performed interviews in the field." (IST2, IBB representative, 2021)

Due to lack of data among the national governmental agencies, IZBB also embarked on a quest to produce their own data. Identification of crop types and collection of data subsequent to the field studies they performed, IZBB tried to answer questions such as what type of crop is suitable to be produced in which region and what are the experiences of the producers there. After that data collection analysis phase, IZBB decided on different food-related projects that they wanted to implement. IZBB also aims to build an inventory using geographic information gathered via satellite and drone images and to design a database for storing information on production practices, technical issues and manufacturer records which is eventually aimed to be developed into an overarching data collection and analysis system:

> "We worked on the basis of basins, we investigated how much of which products are produced how efficiently in the districts in the three big basins and which cooperatives process them." (IZM1, IZBB representative, 2021)

[38] https://www.karasaban.net/belediyeler-ve-tarim-adnan-cobanoglu/

> "We plan to create a comprehensive data inventory. We want to combine real data with field observations and want all those data to be recorded in the institutional memory. We want to create an agricultural dashboard by mapping." (IZM1, IZBB representative, 2021)

5.7. National and international network building

Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality tries to be a role model for other municipalities by becoming a member in international alliances such as "The Glasgow Food and Climate Declaration" and is currently in the process of signing "The Milan Urban Food Policy Pact", being the second signatory municipality from Turkey after Mezitli, Mersin (Milan Urban Food Policy Pact, n.d.; Istanbul Food Strategy, 2021).

Izmir Metropolitan Municipality is building international connections based on food as well. IZBB participates in international initiatives such as Cittaslow, the "Slow city", and the international gastronomy fair Terra Madre, a side project of "Slow Food", which was organized in Izmir in 2022 for the first time. Izmir is the second signatory city of "The Glasgow Food and Climate Declaration" from Turkey.

In addition to international alliances, Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality tries to establish partnerships with other metropolitan and non-metropolitan cities and district municipalities in Turkey, including Izmir, Ankara, Antalya, Adana, Mersin, Hatay, Aydın, Tekirdağ, Muğla and Eskişehir Metropolitan Municipalities. Yet, the ideological divergences and competing interests between various political actors can be read between the lines in the statements of municipality representatives or directly expressed by other civil society representatives:

> "We met 4 times with 11 metropolitan cities and 1 non-metropolitan municipality. There is solidarity among us and relationships with their cooperatives. When district municipalities call on us, we accept those [requests for support] who are suitable for the change and transformation we strive for." (IST4, IBB representative, 2021)

> "As far as I understand, IBB does not have close ties with [Istanbul's] district level municipalities." (IST5, consumer cooperative representative and scholar-activist in Istanbul, 2022)

5.8. A focus on the economic returns to agriculture

In Izmir, there are efforts to build a food and agricultural system where the municipality is involved in the processes from the production to the final marketing phase. Instead of selling the products as raw materials and let them be processed and turned into final products in other places, IZBB strives for completely local processes to add further value to the agricultural production in Izmir. In parallel, the current number of the geographically indicated products in Izmir are seen as insufficient and there is the intention to raise that number:

> "We especially aim to increase the added value of the products and the share of small-scale producers. They always lie at the heart of our supports." (IZM1, IZBB representative, 2021)

> "Tunç Soyer gives enormous support, especially in the marketing of the products." (IZM1, IZBB representative, 2021)

Izmir Metropolitan Municipality supports the producer cooperatives through buying their products to be sold and to be used in municipal subsidiary facilities such as İzmir Metro A.Ş. and İZELMAN A.Ş. This move was perceived as a remarkable contribution for the existence and continuity of producer cooperatives in Izmir. Moreover, these supports helped the emergence of new markets for the producer cooperatives and construction of a trust relationship between producers and consumers:

> "The fact that the municipality is buying products from cooperatives is a significant support in fierce and competitive market conditions." (IZM3, producer cooperative representative in İzmir, 2022)

> "There is a vision of transformation with the consumers, and it has already started. The consumers began to trust and even prefer cooperative products. Until today, our biggest problem was the lack of market, now the market has emerged spontaneously." (IZM4, producer cooperative representative in İzmir, 2022)

In conjunction with the stressed points above, the economic value of food has been emphasized for various times in the interviews in İzmir. Particularly, agricultural products are expected to penetrate international markets and, to that end, IZBB has established an export unit. The emphasis put on the economic value of the food and agriculture has been confirmed by one of the scholar-activists working on food sovereignty in Turkey as follows:

"Marketing is part of the [food] strategy in Izmir." (ACA2, Scholar- activist in Izmir, 2022)

The rationale behind this international marketization strategy has been explained as follows by one of our interviewees from the IZBB:

> "The key to surviving in the Middle East, where economic and political volatility is high, is doing business internationally. If you export, you will earn more money and if you can keep on exporting you will survive. That's why we are thinking of preparing all our products and manufacturers for export and considering the foreign market rather than the domestic market. For this reason, an export team will be formed and will prepare the products for export. Since Izmir is a port city, it can climb up the ladder in terms of exports very quickly" (IZM1, IZBB representative, 2021)

However, there are also several difficulties with the export orientation perspective of the IZBB and opinions diverge in terms of priority areas of IZBB and of economic returns among producer cooperatives heads that I interviewed. One of the interviewees even suggested that export-orientation is not the priority of IZBB:

> "Adequate infrastructure is required for exports. Turkey's export competitiveness to EU countries is very weak. There is a serious decrease in [agricultural] yield due to global climate change. Also due to the Customs Union agreement, tariffs are high for small-sized packaged products. Therefore, your costs [those of farmers] are high. I think rather than focusing on exports, it would be better if the municipalities work on price regulation in the domestic market and supporting the [producer] cooperatives." (IZM3, producer cooperative representative in İzmir, 2022)

> "Izmir Metropolitan Municipality does not care about exporting and making money because they constantly have to support and feed people living here. Izmir Metropolitan Municipality has only one concern: production, organic agriculture, and producing with good agricultural practices. Also feeding the public with the right [healthy] products and to encourage them to produce." (IZM4, producer cooperative representative in İzmir, 2022)

In Istanbul, in contrast, export-orientation motives are not visible at all. The motivation behind farmer supports cannot go beyond the efforts to stop farmers giving up agricultural production and animal husbandry and ensuring they are able to generate a decent level of income out of their farming activities:

> "There are 151 villages within Istanbul's boundaries and most of them make a living from agriculture. We want to guarantee [the continuation of] farming in Istanbul by ensuring that all of them can make a living from agriculture." (IST4, IBB representative, 2022)

5.9. Ability to feed the city's residents

The major challenge of Istanbul is relying heavily on the agricultural supplies coming from other regions of Turkey and hence not being able to feed itself. Despite being dependent on meat and wheat from outside of its boundaries, Istanbul used to feed itself with fruits and vegetables grown in the inner city bostans and in the surrounding villages in the past. According to the municipality representatives' estimates, if the continuity of the bostans could be secured, the ability of producers to produce ensured, and agricultural products from Northern and Southern Thrace could be provided to Istanbul directly via close collaboration with producers there, 70-80% of the food consumed in the city could be provided and this would also reduce the carbon footprint of the food supply chain for Istanbul. Although it is not possible for Istanbul to become completely self-sufficient, it would be possible to reduce its dependency in these ways. The problem of feeding the city is the main force giving an impetus to the municipal strategies to secure flexibility against unpredictable crises, such as the latest pandemic of COVID-19, given that Istanbul is highly fragile in terms of food security. Despite these vulnerabilities, Istanbul could have the potential to change the course of food system in Turkey, according to the municipality representatives:

> "The food that Istanbul produces in a year can feed its residents for approximately only one day, while the remaining 364 days are supplied from other places, both inside and outside the country. Although Istanbul has limited [agricultural] space, it is symbolically important to do these here and inspire others." (IST4, IBB representative, 2021)

The major advantage of Izmir is being able to feed itself due to the vast variety of products produced in its hinterland. Even if the main arteries of food supply became unusable for some unexpected reason, Izmir would have the elasticity for the continuation of food provision. Another advantage of Izmir is that it is a port city located near the main supply arteries:

> "Izmir is a rich province with an extremely high crop and animal production and product diversity." (IZM1, Izmir Metropolitan Municipality representative, 2021)

Although the product variety of Izmir is quite rich, the production planning plays a big role in achieving effective production and distribution of food in the region. However, this seems to be lacking and this has been identified as one of the big challenges of Izmir, according to municipality representatives.

5.10. Food security and food sovereignty

Both metropolitan municipalities mobilize the discourses of food security and food sovereignty. For instance, IBB has been the first local government to reflect on food sovereignty[39], food security and right to food in Turkey by making explicit references 9, 33 and 11 times in its food strategy document, respectively (Istanbul Food Strategy Document, 2021).

Food security has widespread coverage in this document and is referred to as the leading goal of the entire document. Moreover, the strategy document acknowledges the presence and interrelatedness of food insecurity, health issues and unfair income distribution of the people living in Istanbul and establishes a connection between food security and other social policies:

> "The main objective of the Istanbul Food Strategy Document is to ensure that food security is not "to eat by chance" or to provide occasional food aid to citizens who cannot access food through food banks, but to consistently provide food produced with fair, healthy, cheap, local and eco-friendly food and agriculture systems and present it to the people of Istanbul." (Istanbul Food Strategy, 2021, p. 38)

> "Istanbul City Administration aims to create a comprehensive social security policy that can prevent both structural poverty and food insecurity." (Istanbul Food Strategy, 2021, p. 39)

> "The fact that food insecurity, which has become apparent in the form of obesity and malnutrition, causes diabetes, heart and blood pressure diseases, and some types of cancer, requires careful handling of the issue in terms of health. For this reason, the right of access to healthy and cheap food for the city of Istanbul has been determined as one of the most important objectives of the Istanbul Food Strategy Document." (Istanbul Food Strategy, 2021, p. 12)

Being referred to in the Istanbul Strategy Document multiple times, food sovereignty is discussed based on its general explanations and origins of the term. Additionally, its relationship with the other social-justice focused food discourses and the current food system is described in the document.

[39] https://polenekoloji.org/istanbul-gida-strateji-belgesi-uzerine-degerlendirmeler/

However, there is no clear political goal that refers to food sovereignty among the short-, medium- or long-term objectives.

Based on the goals of this document, IBB tries to build a system to support small-scale farmers, producer cooperatives and consumers as new players in the urban agri-food policymaking. On the other hand, İZBB has recently started to use food sovereignty concept in a context close to national sovereignty. The mayor of Izmir, Tunç Soyer, has expressed this as follows: "We need to reduce our dependence on other countries so that we can feed our people living on [these] fertile lands and preserve food sovereignty[40]". Due to Tunç Soyer's previous mayorship in the Seferihisar Municipality and the adoption of "Slow Food" practices there (Özatağan and Ayalp, 2021), he continues framing food and agriculture mainly within this concept in Izmir, while adding food sovereignty and food safety discourses to the official narrative. Although the emergence of the discourse of food sovereignty is quite recent, IZBB has long been promoting food and agriculture policies that aim to support small-scale farmers and producer cooperatives and to enable people's access to food in practice as a result of its history.

Even though the different pillars, demands and the ideology of food sovereignty are quite clearly articulated in several documents like Nyeleni 2007 Declaration of Food Sovereignty, the concept has been used several times in different contexts with different interpretations in Turkey, like the statement of Tunç Soyer mentioned above. In response, some of the food sovereignty scholars in Turkey that were interviewed point out to its radical roots and its actual focus on its social dimensions:

> "Food sovereignty concept has a radical perspective, and it should be considered and applied as such. It is a very dynamic concept; it has come to this day by making expansions. The International Planning Committee on Food Sovereignty has been preparing to connect the concept with the labor, ecology and women's movement" (ACA2, Scholar- activist in Izmir)

The food crises during COVID-19 pandemic have led to some unprecedented repercussions in Turkey with respect to the use of food sovereignty concept. Politicians have started to use food sovereignty in terms of "national sovereignty, import-export balance and self-sufficiency" which is extremely out of context (Interviewee ACA1). According to the interviewee ACA2, "conceptually, food sovereignty remained latent for a long time and the concept is mostly circulated through Çiftçi-Sen in Turkey which had limited opportunities in terms of accessing and organizing people". The concept of food sovereignty is still used only by a limited number of individuals in Turkey's political

[40] https://www.izmir.bel.tr/tr/Haberler/mera-izmir-ile-ureticiye-6-milyon-lira-destek/46715/156

arena and even fewer of them utilize it in line with the main ideals of food sovereignty movement, perhaps with the exception of Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality's Food Strategy Document, which has extensive references to the concept being loyal to the original principles of food sovereignty. How this document will be operationalized in practice, however, remains currently an open question. On the other hand, the claim that urban food policies almost never adopt a justice-related lens, such as the justice-based principles of food sovereignty (Smaal et al 2021), seems to be valid for IZBB, which prioritizes "Slow Food" ideas such as market-based coordination and socially responsible consumers (Thompson and Kumar, 2018). While IZBB intensively implements policies to support farmers, some of its projects are criticized on the basis that they diverge from food sovereignty principles:

> "There are positive steps in terms of local development model, but when we put the food sovereignty filter, we see that there is no participation in Izmir" (ACA1, Scholar- activist in Istanbul)

> "Under the strategy of "Another Agriculture is Possible", we see that IZBB has taken many steps towards corporate farming, which has no place in food sovereignty. Here, the concepts of the corporate farming such as start-ups, technoparks, hydroponic and vertical farming emerge which has nothing to do with food sovereignty." (ACA2, Scholar- activist in Izmir)

Table 5.1. A short summary of the study's findings for the food policies of IBB and IZBB.

	IBB	IZBB
Food governance strategies and policy approaches		
• **Objectives**	Supporting small-scale producers, producer cooperatives and organizations Establishing long-term and permanent policies Shortening the supply chain Keeping farmers at production	Supporting small-scale producers, producer cooperatives and organizations Establishing long-term and permanent policies Shortening the supply chain Creating higher value-added in agriculture
• **Support to producers**	Started with recently elected municipal government	In effect for the last few decades
• **Producer markets**	Kadıköy and Beşiktaş, local producers and cooperatives from all Turkey	Pagos, Bergama, Kültürpark, Buca; local producers and cooperatives from all Turkey Bostanlı and Balçova, organic producers only
Participation and democratization efforts	Limited	Very limited
Ecological production efforts	Limited	Limited
Contract farming	No (against it ideologically)	Yes (with the aim to benefit farmers)
Theoretical and technical efforts	Yes	Yes
Access to food- and agriculture-related data	Very limited	Very limited
National and international network building	Yes	Yes
A focus on increasing economic returns to agriculture	Very limited	Yes
Ability to feed the city's residents	No	Mostly yes
Food security and food sovereignty discourses and practices	Food sovereignty mostly on discursive level & food security is given more emphasis	Food sovereignty discourse very recently entered official narrative; farmer support has a long history

6. DISCUSSION

The findings presented in the previous section demonstrate that the urban food policies in both Istanbul and Izmir Metropolitan Municipalities emphasize the provision of healthy and nutritious food for all of their residents given the increasing food insecurity and price volatility in Turkey as well as different forms of support to small-scale farmers within their jurisdictions.

The policies devised in Istanbul focus mainly on food security for consumers and lowering the financial burden of producers to prevent them from quitting agricultural production, whereas in Izmir food policies are designed mostly in relation to its high agricultural potential and potential of economic returns including export-related incomes. In fact, Izmir's agricultural production potential may be a leverage point to increase food security for its residents, and small-scale farmer supports provided by IZBB may attenuate barriers to accessing healthy food for low-income residents. Being much more food insecure than Izmir, Istanbul's urban sprawl is a major problem jeopardizing its agricultural potential and increasing its dependency on neighboring areas. Therefore, IBB's food and agricultural policies mainly target small-scale farmers of Istanbul to ensure continuity of agricultural production even though food sovereignty and agroecological production are also stated as clear targets in Istanbul's Food Strategy Document. However, one needs to be aware that "supporting the producer does not automatically mean supporting the consumer" as stated by one of the interviewees (IST3, IBB representative, 2021). Consumers' access to healthy and nutritious food hinges on the existence of both national and municipal food policies, as well as other related non-food policies, which should ensure that consumers possess the necessary social, economic and physical opportunities for meeting their food needs. The recent references to food sovereignty made by the IZBB's mayor associating it with national sovereignty reveal that currently the use of the concept does not refer to the transformative and radical principles of the movement such as re-claiming control and access for farmers, community survival, and social and economic justice, for instance. On the other hand, exceptional small-scale farmer supports and endorsement for ecological production constitute a promising place to continue from.

Food governance strategies and policy approaches in Istanbul and Izmir are still quite new despite previous farmer supports in Izmir. The agri-food policymaking in both cities often cannot go beyond a "problem-oriented approach" (Doernberg et al., 2019), as these policies have first and foremost to address increased food imports, and the decrease in agricultural activities due to extremely high input prices and food insecurity of their residents. These problems may be the reason

for not embracing a more strategic and "opportunity-oriented" approach as indicated in Doernberg et al (2019, p.11).

IBB and IZBB are mainly criticized for not being able to create spaces for participation and inclusion of producers and consumers in their strategic decisions. Our finding is in parallel with Zerbian and de Luis Romero's study on the city's role and construction of food security. They asserted that "…urban food governance is not necessarily more inclusive" (Zerbian and de Luis Romero, 2021, p.15). This seems to be valid currently for both Istanbul and Izmir, although there are certain efforts to initiate some participatory mechanisms like food councils and market commissions, for instance. Furthermore, the inclusion of private actors to the Food Council in Istanbul seems to be problematic if we consider how food sovereignty principles diverge greatly from market-based logic and agri-business models. This signals the presence of "deliberation spaces where the power is skewed towards already existing elites, rather than leading to more participatory and democratic food systems" (Zerbian and de Luis Romero, 2021, p.15).

Contract farming has been strongly criticized by past literature for undermining the control of farmers over their own production and their autonomy, for accelerating proletarianization, encouraging corporate concentration in agriculture and strengthening industrial agriculture (Vicol et al., 2021). This is probably why one of the interviewees, a representative from IBB, has stated that IBB is ideologically against contract farming. It is still important to note that this interviewee believed there are different formats regarding how to do contract farming, and one could come up with a more equitable version of it in practice, with a non-profit target in mind that could potentially benefit farmers. Following up whether the actual implementation of contract farming by IZBB will adhere to these equity-based principles would be fruitful work for future studies. In case producers will be strictly bound by the municipality's requests and high standards, and risk is not distributed evenly between farmers and the municipality, this is unlikely to become a democratic process, as is the case between farmers and agri-business corporations in Turkey (Al, 2020). More observation and evidence are needed in future regarding the implementation of this policy in Izmir.

Both IBB and IZBB have efforts towards improving ecological production possibilities in their jurisdictions. For instance, IZBB supports the producers with local seeds while IBB takes a step further by planting seedlings to distribute. Both IZBB and IBB are trying to expand biological control instead of the use of heavy chemicals. Yet, critiques voice the concern that there is much to be improved in terms of agroecology and that specific policies often contradict each other. Distributing hybrid seeds, not offering soil analysis to farmers, or investing in research for vertical gardens or

similar techno-fixes which utilize a higher amount of chemicals are among these contradicting policies. This is probably again a result of adopting "a problem-based approach" as was emphasized above (Doernberg et al 2019). Both municipalities try to address several different problems at the same time like food poverty, economic returns of farmers, etc. and therefore experiment with different, even sometimes patchy, "solutions" which do not belong to a coherent strategic package.

Two distinct dimensions for which IZBB clearly differs from IBB are the former's focus on increasing the economic returns to agriculture and ability to feed the city's residents. The underlying reason for these is related to the physical circumstances like the amount of their agricultural areas, and therefore agricultural production level, as well as the size of their population. Historically, Izmir has always been one of the top cities in Turkey in terms of agricultural production, whereas Istanbul had mostly been a city dependent on outside sources of agricultural production with a bigger population, at least since the Ottoman Empire period.

In addition to these main findings, we could also confirm the previous literature implying that the nation-wide political instability reduces the room for maneuver for municipal governments substantially due to the political conflicts between the central government and local municipalities. For instance, it had been argued that the frictions between local governments and national governance organs constitute obstacles in the way of "new municipalism" (Morley and Morgan, 2021). Our interviews demonstrate that, perhaps unsurprisingly, that there are substantial barriers for the implementation of more progressive food policies due to the tensions between the central governments and local municipalities. The conflicts seem to be stemming from jurisdictional overlaps mainly a result of the absence of national food and agricultural policies and changes in the jurisdiction areas of the metropolitan municipalities. Progressive policies are often blocked by legal sanctions and bureaucratic pressures of the central government. Our findings therefore confirm that the political tensions between the ruling party and the municipalities from the oppositional political party prevent the execution as well as the spread of novel food policies.

Despite the fact that there are tendencies and some willingness to implement a food sovereignty framework within both municipalities, food sovereignty discourse seems to be adopted whenever it serves the main aspirations of both municipalities. For Istanbul, targets related with food poverty and food security are dominating the formal municipal discourses even though representatives of the municipal government emphasize the need to be more aligned with food sovereignty ideals such as ecological production, localization, giving back to farmers, acknowledging "food for people" and not for profit. In Izmir, in contrast, support to farmers assumes a central role in food policies, yet, food

sovereignty concept has very recently entered the official discourse and seems to be used in a rather patchy manner. The use of food sovereignty concept contradicts other food policies of IZBB focusing on strengthening the role of start-ups, technoparks, hydroponic and vertical farming which are mainly representative of corporate farming practices. This may be related with the historically close relations of the current food policy team of IZBB with the Slow Food movement, which does not prioritize justice-related concepts, but instead relies on markets and individual consumer behavior for a change in the food system. In Istanbul, however, the influence of Çiftçi-Sen has shaped a rather more visible social movement supporting food sovereignty among consumer initiatives and as a result, food sovereignty has entered IBB's food policy discourse earlier than in Izmir. However, it is still very early to assert that this tendency will get broader support within IBB.

Additionally, our interviews reveal that a broader, more systematic approach to food policies is missing in the context of Turkey. Food policies of both IBB and IZBB currently lack comprehensive social, ecological and economic perspectives including land-use management, transportation, infrastructure, housing, ecological preservation, education and worker rights. This is in line with the past literature on the boundaries of food policies and the analysis performed on urban food strategies of various European cities (Cohen and Ilieva, 2021; Moragues-Faus et al., 2013). For instance, the animal husbandry activities carried out in Küçük Menderes Basin in Izmir have resulted in a shift towards monoculture and an excessive usage of water resources in the basin. Izmir Metropolitan Municipality supports these activities to support agricultural practices in the basin by opening up an integrated meat facility and a milk processing facility. Yet, these are criticized for contradicting ecological aspects of effective food policies. Similarly, Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality does not address issues such as pollution in Ergene River and deep discharge into the Sea of Marmara which affect the environment and eventually what people eat. As Coulson and Sonnino argues, this limited perspective on food policies implies that Istanbul and Izmir's "urban food governance mechanisms are forms of institutional 'food-fixes' that seek to address some of the negative externalities of the capitalist food system" (Coulson and Sonnino, 2018, p. 2). The absence of a more holistic, systematic approach was also articulated by one of the interviewees as follows:

> "I feel like the strategical part is still missing. I think the solutions are acute and acontextual. The solutions are required to be systematized and well-planned. Long-term planning and impact analysis are needed. Instead, the process includes immediate actions rather than any planned ones." (IST3, IBB representative, 2021)

In Turkey, it is very interesting to observe that the food sovereignty discourse has even been adopted by political parties with nationalistic tendencies[41]. Presumably, the sovereignty with respect to food, in a way, resembles national sovereignty sentiments within this tendency. As such, it is important to note that there is potential for the term to be co-opted not only by corporate agriculture representatives, but also, surprisingly, by nationalistic tendencies within the political context of Turkey. This is in line with the finding in the literature stating that food sovereignty's "progressive" inclinations might be co-opted by "reformist regimes" which turn it into "national-popular or 'subhegemonic' food sovereignty (reformist capitalism)" (Tilzey, 2019; Tilzey 2020).

Currently, the transformative potential of the food policies of Istanbul and Izmir seems limited, even though there are substantial efforts on the side of both municipal governments. However, one has also to note that, given the current political instability as well as other national and global economic and political pressures, it is very difficult for both municipalities to act outside "the economic and political frameworks of existing capitalist food system" (Holt-Giménez and Shattuck, 2011, p. 115), even if there seems to be the willingness to adopt more radical policies, at least for some of the municipal constituents. The radical political approach of food sovereignty and the imagination of "peasant agriculture in a post-capitalist socio-economic model" is currently missing in the food policies of both IBB and IZBB implying that they are rather striving for enacting policies aiming at a "change within the system" (Siebert, 2019, p. 6). However, this should not downgrade their efforts towards supporting farmers and securing access to food for their residents.

[41] https://www.memleketpartisi.org.tr/parti/kamuoyu-duyurulari/gida-egemenligi-100-maddelik-cozum-onerimiz

7. CONCLUSION

In this study, I systematically analyzed the urban food policies of the two newly elected municipal governments in Istanbul and Izmir. Urban policy makers in Turkey are rather inexperienced in agri-food policymaking compared to globally pioneering cities. I performed this analysis utilizing both food security and food sovereignty frameworks, as the use of these concepts are expanding in the urban settings of Turkey. We identified different urban food policy evaluation dimensions to understand the "boundaries of the food policies" in Istanbul and Izmir (Cohen and Ilieva, 2021). These dimensions might be useful to evaluate the extent of the agri-food policies performing within "social justice-oriented narratives" of food security and food sovereignty (Smaal et al., 2021).

The results therefore contribute to the systematic analysis of the role of local governments in different developing country contexts, where municipal boundaries overlap with the jurisdictions of the central governments in terms of food policy making. Additionally, the present study illuminates the ways in which municipal governments reflect on their own food policy making, and how other stakeholders like scholar-activists and farmers organizations respond to these struggles.

Despite being a late comer to the urban food governance discussions compared to several countries from both the Global South and the North, Turkey presents a case with a potential for more equitable food policy making and is promising in terms of its appeals to the progressive ideas of both food security and food sovereignty. However, this situation largely hinges on achieving inclusiveness and novel democratization spaces. Moreover, our study may shed light on the co-optation of food sovereignty and its conscious or unconscious misappropriation utilized in the political arena.

As Sonnino states, "it is too early to assess how successful urban food policies will be in reshaping the dominant food system" (Sonnino, 2019, p. 17). Therefore, future research may benefit from the present comparative study by building on the potentials of urban food policies and the role of local governments in transforming the food system status-quo, especially in the Mediterranean countries with similar climatic conditions.

REFERENCES

Al, I. S., & Küçük, B. (2019). In-between Anxiety and Hope: Trusting an Alternative Among 'Alternatives' in the (Post) Organic Food Market in Turkey. *The International Journal of Sociology of Agriculture and Food*, *25*(2), 173-190.

Al, I. S. (2020). The Promising Momentum and Collective Practices of the Recently Expanding Network of Consumer-Led Ecological Food Initiatives in Turkey. *Istanbul University Journal of Sociology*, *40*(1), 129-162.

Atalan-Helicke, N., & Abiral, B. (2021). Alternative food distribution networks, resilience, and urban food security in Turkey during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems, and Community Development*, *10*(2), 89-104.

Aydın, Z. (2010). Neo- Liberal transformation of Turkish agriculture. *Journal of Agrarian Change*, *10*(2), 149-187.

Baker, L., & de Zeeuw, H. (2015). Urban food policies and programmes: An overview, 26–55, *Cities and Agriculture: Developing resilient urban food systems*. Routledge, London, UK.

Battersby, J. (2017). Food system transformation in the absence of food system planning: The case of supermarket and shopping mall retail expansion in Cape Town, South Africa. *Built Environment*, *43*(3), 417-430.

Bricas, N. (2019). Urbanization issues affecting food system sustainability, 1-25, *Designing Urban Food Policies: Concepts and approaches*, Springer International Publishing.

Bricas, N., & Conaré, D. (2019). Historical perspectives on the ties between cities and food. *Field Actions Science Reports. The journal of field actions*, (Special Issue 20), 6-11.

Broad Leib, E. M. (2013). All (food) politics is local: Increasing food access through local government action. *Harv. L. & Pol'y Rev.*, *7*, 321.

Candel, J. J. (2020). What's on the menu? A global assessment of MUFPP signatory cities' food strategies. *Agroecology and Sustainable Food Systems, 44*(7), 919-946.

Clapp, J. (2014). Food security and food sovereignty: Getting past the binary. *Dialogues in Human Geography, 4*(2), 206-211.

Cohen, N., & Ilieva, R. T. (2021). Expanding the boundaries of food policy: the turn to equity in New York City. *Food Policy, 103*, 102012.

Conaré, D. (2019). Introduction. In *Designing urban food policies: Concepts and approaches*, xi–xviii. Springer International Publishing.

Coulson, H., & Sonnino, R. (2019). Re-scaling the politics of food: Place-based urban food governance in the UK. *Geoforum, 98*, 170-179.

Demirci, S., & Coşar, N. (2021). Modernisation through Railways: Economic and Social Change in the Ottoman Empire in the Nineteenth Century. *Journal of Balkan and Near Eastern Studies, 23*(5), 684-694.

Doernberg, A., Horn, P., Zasada, I., & Piorr, A. (2019). Urban food policies in German city regions: An overview of key players and policy instruments. *Food Policy, 89*, 101782.

Edelman, M., Weis, T., Baviskar, A., Borras Jr, S. M., Holt-Giménez, E., Kandiyoti, D., & Wolford, W. (2014). Introduction: critical perspectives on food sovereignty. *Journal of Peasant Studies, 41*(6), 911-931.

Edwards, F. (2016). Alternative food networks. *Encyclopedia of food and agricultural ethics. Dordrecht: Springer*, 1-7.

Ellis, F., & Sumberg, J. (1998). Food production, urban areas and policy responses. *World Development, 26*(2), 213-225.

European Coordination Via Campesina, A Guide to Food Sovereignty, (2018). https://viacampesina.org/en/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2018/02/Food-Sovereignty-A-guide-Low-Res-Vresion.pdf. Date accessed September 2022.

Fages, R., & Bricas, N. (2017). Food for Cities. What roles for local governments in the Global South?. Paris: Agence Française de Développement (AFD). Available at: https://www.afd.fr/en/ressources/afd-food-cities. Date accessed September 2022.

FAO, (2001). *State of Food Insecurity in the World 2001*. Rome: FAO. Available at: http://www.fao.org/docrep/003/y1500e/y1500e00.htm. Date accessed September 2022.

FAO, (2020). Cities and Local Governments at the Forefront in Building Inclusive and Resilient Food Systems: Key Results from the FAO Survey "Urban Food Systems and COVID-19". *FAO: Rome, Italy*.

Frangakis, E. (1985). The ottoman port of Izmir in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, 1695-1820. *Revue des mondes musulmans et de la Méditerranée*, *39*(1), 149-162.

García-Sempere, A., Hidalgo, M., Morales, H., Ferguson, B. G., Nazar-Beutelspacher, A., & Rosset, P. (2018). Urban transition toward food sovereignty. *Globalizations*, *15*(3), 390-406.

García-Sempere, A., Morales, H., Hidalgo, M., Ferguson, B. G., Rosset, P., & Nazar-Beutelspacher, A. (2019). Food Sovereignty in the city?: A methodological proposal for evaluating food sovereignty in urban settings. *Agroecology and Sustainable Food Systems*, *43*(10), 1145-1173.

Greenpeace Turkey, Türkiye'nin Gıda Sistemi ve İstanbul'un Tedarik Zinciri, (2019). https://www.greenpeace.org/static/planet4-turkey-stateless/2019/11/e641d246-türkiyenin-gıda-ve-tarım-sistemi-rapor.pdf. Date accessed September 2022.

Greenpeace Turkey, İstanbul Nasıl Beslenir: Üretici Pazarları Odağında Alternatifler ve Olanaklar, (2020). https://www.greenpeace.org/static/planet4-turkey-stateless/9e4ebafa-greenpeace-rapor-istanbul-nasil-beslenir-2021.pdf. Date accessed September 2022.

Halliday, J. (2019). Cities' strategies for sustainable food and the levers they mobilize. In *Designing Urban Food Policies*, (pp. 53-74). Springer, Cham.

Hawkes, C., & Halliday, J. (2017). What makes urban food policy happen? Insights from five case studies. International Panel of Experts on Sustainable Food Systems.

Heynen, N., Kaika, M., & Swyngedouw, E. (2006). Urban political ecology: politicizing the production of urban natures. In *In the nature of cities* (pp. 16-35). Routledge.

Holt Giménez, E., & Shattuck, A. (2011). Food crises, food regimes and food movements: rumblings of reform or tides of transformation?. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, *38*(1), 109-144.

Holt-Giménez, E., & van Lammeren, I. (2018). Can food as a commons advance food sovereignty?. In *Routledge Handbook of Food as a Commons* (pp. 313-328). Routledge.

Kadirbeyoğlu, Z., & Konya, N. (2017). Alternative food initiatives in Turkey. *Neoliberal Modernization and Economic Growth in Turkey: Environment, Development and Conflict*, 207-230.

Kaldjian, P. J. (2003). Urban food security, the rural Hinterland, and Istanbul's lower income migrant households. In *Food, Agriculture, and Economic Policy in the Middle East and North Africa*. Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Kay, S., Mattheisen, E., McKeon, N., De Meo, P., & Faus, A. M. (2018). Public Policies for Food Sovereignty: Think Piece Series Food for Thought No. 1.

Kızılboğa, R., Alıcı, O. V. (2013). Türkiye'de kırsal alan belediyeciliği ve büyükşehir belediyelerinde il mülki sınırı uygulaması. *Türk İdare Dergisi*, (476), 353- 381.

Koç, M., & Koç, H. (1999). From Staple Store to Supermarket: The Case of TANSAS in Izmir, Turkey. *For Hunger-proof Cities: Sustainable Urban Food Systems*, 115.

Kocagöz, U., & Doğançayır, C. M. (2017, April 24). Operationalizing food sovereignty: A critical approach from an ongoing experiment in Turkey. Paper presented at the International Colloquium on the Future of Food and Challenges for Agriculture in the 21st Century. Vitoria-Gasteiz, Spain.

Kurtsal, Y., Ayalp, E. K., & Viaggi, D. (2020). Exploring governance mechanisms, collaborative processes and main challenges in short food supply chains: the case of Turkey. *Bio-Based Appl. Econ*, *9*, 201-221.Küçükkalay, 2008

Küçükkalay, M. (2008). Imports to Smyrna between 1794 and 1802: New Statistics from the Ottoman Sources. *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*, *51*(3), 487-512.

Loker, A., & Francis, C. (2020). Urban food sovereignty: urgent need for agroecology and systems thinking in a post-COVID-19 future. *Agroecology and Sustainable Food Systems*, *44*(9), 1118-1123.

Lyons, K. (2014). Urban food advocates' tactics to rebuild food systems: convergence and divergence in food security and food sovereignty discourses. *Dialogues in Human Geography*, *4*(2), 212-217.

Massachusetts Food System Collaborative, Local Food Systems: The role of municipal governments, (2018). https://secureservercdn.net/45.40.145.201/ghl.292.myftpupload.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/Municipal_Food_System_Tool.pdf. Date accessed September 2022.

Maxwell, S. (1996). Food security: a post-modern perspective. *Food policy*, *21*(2), 155-170.

Moragues, A.; Morgan, K.; Moschitz, H.; Neimane, I.; Nilsson, H.; Pinto, M.; Rohracher,H.; Ruiz, R.; Thuswald, M.; Tisenkopfs, T. and Halliday, J. (2013). Urban Food Strategies: The rough guide to sustainable food systems. Document developed in the framework of the FP7 project FOODLINKS (GA No. 265287).

Moragues-Faus, A., & Morgan, K. (2015). Reframing the foodscape: the emergent world of urban food policy. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, *47*(7), 1558-1573.

Moragues-Faus, A., & Battersby, J. (2021). Urban food policies for a sustainable and just future: Concepts and tools for a renewed agenda. *Food Policy*, *103*, 102-124.

Morley, A., & Morgan, K. (2021). Municipal foodscapes: Urban food policy and the new municipalism. *Food Policy*, *103*, 102069.

Murphey, R. (1987). Provisioning Istanbul: the state and subsistence in the early modern Middle East. *Food and Foodways*, *2*(1), 217-263.

Nyeleni Newsletter no.35, Food sovereignty at the rural-urban interface, (2018). https://nyeleni.org/DOWNLOADS/newsletters/Nyeleni_Newsletter_Num_35_EN.pdf. Date accessed September 2022.

Overseas Development Institute, Global hunger and food security after the World Food Summit, (1997). ODI Briefing Paper 1997 (1) February. London: Overseas Development Institute. https://cdn.odi.org/media/documents/2630.pdf. Date accessed September 2022.

Öz, Ö., & Aksoy, Z. (2019). Challenges of building alternatives: the experience of a consumer food co-operative in Istanbul. *Food, Culture & Society*, 22(3), 299-315.

Özatağan, G., & Ayalp, E. K. (2021). Sustainable futures of agro-food? İzmir's sustainable agro-food transitions in the making. *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions*, *40*, 283-295.

Pothukuchi, K., & Kaufman, J. L. (1999). Placing the food system on the urban agenda: The role of municipal institutions in food systems planning. *Agriculture and Human Values*, 16(2), 213-224.

Sen, A. (1982). *Poverty and Famines: An Essay on Entitlement and Deprivation*. Oxford University Press.

Shopov, A. (2021). When Istanbul Was a City of Bostāns: Urban Agriculture and Agriculturists. In *A Companion to Early Modern Istanbul* (pp. 279-307). Brill.

Siebert, A. (2020). Transforming urban food systems in South Africa: Unfolding food sovereignty in the city. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, *47*(2), 401-419.

Smaal, S. A., Dessein, J., Wind, B. J., & Rogge, E. (2021). Social justice-oriented narratives in European urban food strategies: Bringing forward redistribution, recognition and representation. *Agriculture and Human Values*, *38*(3), 709-727.

Sonnino, R. (2014). The new geography of food security: exploring the potential of urban food strategies. *The Geographical Journal*, *182*(2), 190-200.

Sonnino, R., Tegoni, C. L., & De Cunto, A. (2019). The challenge of systemic food change: Insights from cities. *Cities*, *85*, 110-116.

Sonnino, R. (2019). The cultural dynamics of urban food governance. *City, Culture and Society*, *16*, 12-17.

Tekeli, I. (2018). Izmir Belediyeciliğinde 2004-2018 Döneminin Öyküsü. İzmir Büyükşehir Belediyesi Akdeniz Akademisi.

Thompson, M. S., Cochrane, A., & Hopma, J. (2020). Democratising food: The case for a deliberative approach. *Review of International Studies*, *46*(4), 435-455.

Thompson, C. J., & Kumar, A. (2021). Beyond consumer responsibilization: Slow Food's actually existing neoliberalism. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 21(2), 317-336.

Thompson, M. (2021). What's so new about New Municipalism?. *Progress in Human Geography*, 45(2), 317-342.

Tilzey, M. (2019). Authoritarian populism and neo-extractivism in Bolivia and Ecuador: the unresolved agrarian question and the prospects for food sovereignty as counter-hegemony. *Critical Agrarian Studies*, *46*(3), 262-652.

Tilzey, M. (2020). From neoliberalism to national developmentalism? Contested agrarian imaginaries of a postneoliberal future for food and farming. *Journal of Agrarian Change*, *21*(1), 180-201.

Timmermann, C. (2018). Food security as a global public good. In *Routledge Handbook of Food as a Commons* (pp. 85-100). Routledge.

Tornaghi, C., & Dehaene, M. (2020). The prefigurative power of urban political agroecology: rethinking the urbanisms of agroecological transitions for food system transformation. *Agroecology and Sustainable Food Systems*, *44*(5), 594-610.

Turkkan, C. (2018). Feeding the global city: urban transformation and urban food supply chain in 21st-century Istanbul. *Journal of Urbanism: International Research on Placemaking and Urban Sustainability*.

Vara-Sánchez, I., Gallar-Hernández, D., García-García, L., Alonso, N. M., & Moragues-Faus, A. (2021). The co-production of urban food policies: Exploring the emergence of new governance spaces in three Spanish cities. *Food Policy*, *103*, 102120.

Vicol, M., Fold, N., Hambloch, C., Narayanan, S., & Pérez Niño, H. (2022). Twenty- five years of Living Under Contract: Contract farming and agrarian change in the developing world. *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 22(1), 3-18.

Yemen, A. (2017). Büyükşehir belediyelerinin sorunları üzerine bir değerlendirme. In *Belediyelerin Geleceği ve Yeni Yaklaşımlar*, 143- 164. Marmara Belediyeler Birliği Kültür Yayınları.

Yetiskul, E., Aydın, N., & Gökçe, B. (2021). Governing the rural: The case of Izmir (Turkey) in the Post-2000 era. *Journal of Rural Studies, 88*, 262-271.

Zerbe, N. (2018). Food as a Commodity. In *Routledge Handbook of Food as a Commons* (pp. 155-170). Routledge.

Zerbian, T., & de Luis Romero, E. (2021). The role of cities in good governance for food security: lessons from Madrid's urban food strategy. *Territory, Politics, Governance*, 1-19.

APPENDIX A: SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Open-ended questions for municipal representatives:

Meeting questions

- Have you previously undertaken a role in the field of food, or agriculture in civil society, municipalities or the public sector?
- What is your current role in the field of food or agriculture in Istanbul/İzmir Metropolitan Municipality?

Questions on food and agriculture

- Why are agriculture and food important for Istanbul/Izmir Metropolitan Municipality (in social, cultural, economic, and political contexts)?
- What do you think is the biggest problem about food in Istanbul/ Izmir?
- What do you think is the biggest advantage of Istanbul/ Izmir in terms of food?
- Do you think there is a power hierarchy between different actors in the food system? If yes, who do you think has this power and how can this power inequality be resolved?
- Do you think that the food system in Turkey is male-dominated?

Questions about goals and policies

- We see that Istanbul/ Izmir Metropolitan Municipality aims for a transformation in the agriculture and food system. What is aimed at with this transformation?
- What are the new policies that Istanbul/Izmir Metropolitan Municipality has followed to realize this transformation?
- Which one do you think is the most important among the targets and policies followed? Why?
- What are the upcoming projects?
- What difficulties do you face in reaching the goals?

Questions about internal dynamics

- How are these goals and policies determined? What kind of decision mechanism do they have behind them?

- What kind of groups (e.g. municipality member, NGO, academician, cooperative member, producer, consumer, etc.) are the people participating in the process of determining the objectives and policies?
- Is it possible to ensure the participation of different actors in the decisions? If yes, how?
- Are there any disagreements during the decision-making process? If so, how is it solved?

Budget questions

- Does the municipality have a budget allocated for food? What size? How is the use of this budget decided?
- The coronavirus pandemic has shown us the importance of a resilient food system. Do you have any projects to make Istanbul/Izmir resilient and has the municipality allocated a budget for this?

Pricing, contract farming

- How do you implement contract farming and procurement? Why?
- Does the producer decide on the product to be planted in the soil, the seeds/medicine/fertilizers to be used in contract farming, or do you follow a certain strategy?
- Does the municipality have a goal of supporting small producers? If so, how are they supported?
- Is there a target to reach small producers engaged in ecological production?
- How are product prices and diversity determined in producer markets?
- Are the prices and quality of products controlled in producer markets? If the municipality has criteria, how? Is organic certification important?
- Is it preferable to sell products grown in Istanbul/ Izmir, or are all kinds of products sold?
- Are there types of producers you particularly support (Women's associations, cooperatives, organic or ecological producers, etc.)?
- Do you have any practices regarding the producer's access to the markets with his products, the producer's ability to leave the field and sell in the market, and to store and preserve the products?

City and food

- The population of cities is increasing day by day. Are joint steps taken with other municipalities to feed the cities? If yes, with which?

Closing question

- Do you have something to add or share?

Open-ended questions for cooperative representatives:

- How did you become a part of this cooperative?
- Additional questions for producer cooperatives:
    - Izmir has always been a pioneer in cooperatives and yours is one of the first established producer cooperatives. What were its demands and claims when it was first established? What is the difference between these claims and claims today?
    - With whom did agricultural and food supports start in terms of the municipality in İzmir?
- Which of the food and agriculture policies followed by the Istanbul/ Izmir Metropolitan Municipality do you think are well implemented?
- In what areas do you think the Istanbul/Izmir Metropolitan Municipality should improve in terms of agriculture and food policies?
- Do you think Istanbul/ Izmir Metropolitan Municipality aims at a transformation in the food and agriculture system?
- Additional questions for producer cooperatives:
    - Do you think the current Izmir Municipality's production supports are export-oriented?
    - What do you think will be the social benefits of empowering the producer?
    - Do you have a vision for transformation with consumers?
    - Do you think İzmir Municipality's view of food and agriculture coincides with yours?

APPENDIX B: SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW QUESTIONS (TURKISH)

Belediye temsilcilerine yönelik açık uçlu sorular:

Tanışma soruları

- Daha önce gıda veya tarım alanında sivil toplumda, belediyelerde ya da kamuda bir görev üstlenmiş miydiniz?
- İstanbul/İzmir Büyükşehir Belediyesi'nde gıda veya tarım alanında şu anki göreviniz nedir?

Gıda ve tarım üzerine sorular

- İstanbul/İzmir Büyükşehir Belediyesi için tarım ve gıda neden önemli (Sosyal, kültürel, ekonomik ve politik bağlamlarda)?
- Sizce İstanbul/ İzmir'in gıda konusundaki en büyük sorunu nedir?
- Sizce İstanbul/ İzmir'in gıda konusundaki en büyük avantajı nedir?
- Sizce gıda sisteminde farklı aktörler arasında bir güç hiyerarşisi var mı? Var ise kimin bu güce sahip olduğunu düşünüyorsunuz ve bu güç eşitsizliği nasıl çözülebilir?
- Türkiye'deki gıda sisteminin erkek egemen olduğunu düşünüyor musunuz?

Hedef ve politikalara dair sorular

- İstanbul/ İzmir Büyükşehir Belediyesi'nin tarım ve gıda sisteminde bir dönüşüm hedeflediğini görüyoruz. Bu dönüşümle neler hedefleniyor?
- İstanbul/İzmir Büyükşehir Belediyesi'nin bu dönüşümü gerçekleştirmek için izlediği yeni politikalar neler?
- Sizce hedefler ve izlenen politikalar içerisinde en önemlisi hangisi? Neden?
- Gelecek projeler arasında neler var? (İstanbul'un Milano Urban Policy Pact üyelik süreci. İzmir'de de var mı?)
- Hedeflere ulaşmak konusunda ne gibi zorluklarla karşılaşıyorsunuz?

İç dinamiklere dair sorular

- Bu hedef ve politikalar nasıl belirleniyor? Arkalarında nasıl bir karar mekanizması var?
- Hedef ve politikaların belirlenmesi sürecine katılan kişiler ne tür gruplardan (örn. Belediye üyesi, STK, akademisyen, kooperatif mensubu, üretici, tüketici vs.)?
- Kararlara farklı aktörlerin katılımı sağlanabiliyor mu? Evetse nasıl?

- Karara varış sürecinde fikir anlaşmazlıkları oluyor mu? Oluyor ise nasıl bir yöntem izlenerek çözülüyor?

Bütçeye dair sorular

- Belediyenin gıda için ayrılmış bir bütçesi var mı? Ne büyüklükte? Bu bütçenin kullanımına nasıl karar veriliyor?
- Koronavirüs pandemisi bize dayanıklı bir gıda sisteminin önemini gösterdi. İstanbul'u/ İzmir'i dayanıklı hale getirmek için projeleriniz var mı ve bunun için belediye bütçe ayırdı mı?

Fiyatlandırma, sözleşmeli tarım

- Sözleşmeli üretim ve alımı ne şekilde uyguluyorsunuz? Neden?
- Sözleşmeli üretim ve alım içerisinde üretici toprağa ekilecek ürün, kullanacağı tohum/ ilaç/ gübre konusunda kendi mi karar veriyor yoksa belirli bir strateji üzerinden mi gidiliyor?
- Belediyenin küçük üreticileri destekleme gibi bir hedefi var mı? Varsa ne şekilde destekleniyor?
- Ekolojik üretim yapan küçük üreticilere ulaşma hedefi var mı?
- Üretici pazarlarındaki ürün fiyatları ve çeşitliliği nasıl belirleniyor?
- Üretici pazarlarında ürünlerin fiyatları ve kalitesi denetleniyor mu? Belediyenin kriterleri var ise ne şekilde? Organik sertifikasyona önem veriliyor mu?
- İstanbul'da/ İzmir'de yetişen ürünlerin satışı mı tercih ediliyor yoksa her türlü ürün mü satılıyor?
- Özellikle desteklediğiniz üretici tipleri var mı (Kadın dernekleri, kooperatifler, organik veya ekolojik üretim yapan üreticiler vs.)?
- Üreticinin ürünleriyle pazarlara ulaşımı, üreticinin tarlayı bırakıp pazarda satış yapabilmesi, üretilen ürünlerin depolanması ve muhafaza edilmesi konusunda uygulamalarınız var mı?

Şehir ve beslenme

- Şehirlerin nüfusu giderek artıyor. Şehirlerin beslenmesi için diğer belediyelerle ortak adımlar atılıyor mu? Evetse hangileriyle?

Kapanış sorusu

- Eklemek veya paylaşmak istediğiniz bir şey var mı?

Kooperatif temsilcilerine yönelik açık uçlu sorular:

- Nasıl bu kooperatifin bir parçası oldunuz?
- **Üretici kooperatifleri için ek sorular:**
    - İzmir kooperatifçilik konusunda her zaman öncü oldu ve sizinki de ilk kurulan üretici kooperatiflerden biri. İlk kurulduğu zamanlardaki talep ve iddiaları neydi? Günümüzde bu talepler ve iddialarda nasıl bir fark var?
    - İzmir'de belediyecilik açısından tarım ve gıda destekleri kiminle başladı?
- İstanbul/ İzmir Büyükşehir Belediyesi'nin izlediği gıda ve tarım politikalarının hangilerinin iyi uygulandığını düşünüyorsunuz?
- İstanbul/ İzmir Büyükşehir Belediyesi'nin tarım ve gıda politikaları anlamında ne konularda gelişmesi gerektiğini düşünüyorsunuz?
- Sizce İstanbul/ İzmir Büyükşehir Belediyesi gıda ve tarım sisteminde bir dönüşüm hedefliyor mu?
- **Üretici kooperatifleri için ek sorular:**
    - Sizce şu anki İzmir Belediyesi'nin üretim destekleri ihracat odaklı mı?
    - Üreticiyi güçlendirmenin topluma faydaları sizce ne olacak?
    - Tüketicilerle beraber bir dönüşüm tahayyülü var mı?
    - Sizce İzmir Belediyesi'nin gıda ve tarıma bakışı sizinkiyle örtüşüyor mu?

APPENDIX C: QUOTES FROM INTERVIEWS

English	Turkish	Interviewee
Food governance strategies and policy approaches		
When we look at the producers in the land, we see that Istanbul is limited, it is not a market that large producers penetrate, and the ownership structure is complex. Big entrepreneurs most likely prefer other places instead of investing in Istanbul.	Topraktaki üretici açısından baktığımızda zaten İstanbul hem kısıtlı hem de büyük üreticilerin girdiği bir pazar değil. Mülkiyet yapısı da karmaşık ve küçük. Büyük girişimciler İstanbul'a yatırım yapmak yerine Manisa'yı vs. tercih eder muhtemelen.	IST3, IBB representative
In İzmir, agriculturally suitable areas are not as many as it is thought. There are no large plots of lands of production. The lands are scattered, the parcels are small, and the producers which are mostly small ones cannot earn enough to invest in themselves because they produce in small areas.	İzmir'in tarım yapılmaya müsait alanları aslında düşündüğümüz kadar çok değil, büyük parselli üretim alanları yok. Araziler dağınık ve parseller küçük, üretici küçük alanlarda üretim yaptığından kendine yatırım yapacak kadar kazanamıyor (üreticilerin çoğu da küçük üretici).	IZM1, IZBB representative
The producers in Istanbul are mostly small, and we support small and medium-sized producers. Women producers and cooperatives are prioritized.	Genel olarak İstanbul'da küçük üretici var ve biz de küçük ile orta ölçekli üreticileri destekliyoruz. Kadın üreticiler ve kooperatifler öncelikli.	IST4, IBB representative
Izmir Metropolitan Municipality has a unique and traditional approach to the cooperative movement and agriculture in Turkey that comes from the past.	Türkiye'de kooperatif hareketine, İzmir Belediyesi'nin geçmişinden gelen geleneksel, tarıma bakışında bir farklılık var.	IZM3, producer cooperative representative in Izmir
Food is a costly item even if we remove the intermediaries, and the elimination of them does not necessarily mean that the consumer has access to healthy food.	Gıda aracıyı çıkarsak da maliyetli aslında, aracıların çıkması her zaman tüketicinin sağlıklı gıdaya erişmesi demek olmuyor.	IST3, IBB representative
The municipality carries out activities such as seedling, fertilizer, machinery and equipment distribution and training to improve agriculture and redevelopment of	Belediye kent çeperindeki, kırsala yakın alanlarda çiftçiliğin yeniden gelişmesi için fide dağıtımı, makine ekipman dağıtımı, eğitim verilmesi, gübre dağıtımı	IST5, consumer cooperative representative

farming in the peri-urban areas. These actions of the municipality are going better than others. We also talk to many farmers who come to the producer market, and they especially say that the distribution of seedlings, seeds, fertilizers relieve them of a significant financial burden.	gibi tarımı geliştirecek çalışmalar yapıyor. Belediyenin bu alandaki çalışmaları şu anda daha iyi gidiyor. Pazara gelen birçok çiftçiyle de konuşuyoruz, özellikle fide, tohum, gübre dağıtımının onları epey bir mali yükten kurtardığını söylüyorlar.	and scholar-activist in Istanbul
In İzmir, the agricultural production is very intense almost in all the periphery while İstanbul is more consumer-driven.	İzmir'de neredeyse bütün çeper tarımsal üretimin çok yoğun olduğu yerler, İstanbul ise daha çok tüketici güdümlü bir durumda.	ACA2, Scholar-activist in Izmir
When we compare Izmir and Istanbul, Izmir unquestionably surpasses Istanbul in terms of municipalism. For years, cooperatives have developed and grown there. For example, İzmir buys products from cooperatives for all subsidiaries of the municipality and does its best for the existence, survival and growth of cooperatives.	İzmir'le İstanbul kıyaslandığı zaman, İzmir gerçekten yerel belediyecilik anlamında İstanbul'u katlar. Yıllardır orada kooperatifçilik gelişti, büyüdü. İzmir mesela belediyenin bütün iştiraklerine kooperatiflerden ürün alıyor ve kooperatiflerin var olması, yaşaması, büyümesi için elinden geleni yapıyor.	IST5, consumer cooperative representative and scholar-activist in Istanbul
But the producers also mention some inadequacies. Some farmers say that they did not receive seedlings compatible with the soil of their land or they receive the particular seedlings because they were the last ones to take. It is necessary to increase the knowledge on which seedling is needed for which soil and analyze.	Fakat bazı yetersizliklerden de bahsediyorlar. Kimi çiftçi benim toprağıma uygun fide verilmedi diyor, ellerinde bu kalmıştı bunu almak zorunda kaldım ama ben yetiştirdiğim zaman öyle olmayacak diyor. Hangi toprağa hangi fide lazım gibi konularda donanımı arttırmak gerekiyor. Ne kadara ihtiyaç olduğunun analizinin yapılması lazım.	IST5, consumer cooperative representative and scholar-activist in Istanbul
There were many promises made to cooperatives to enhance the producer market equipment; to provide logistic support and storage (a main and a secondary warehouse). None of these promises was kept. There used to be four lines of market stands, now they decreased. Many people cannot come, and the municipality do not come up with a solution about this.	Pazarın daha donanımlı hale gelmesi için kooperatifler için verilmiş bir sürü sözler vardı; lojistik sağlanacak, ana bir depo vereceğiz, bunların arasında tali depo yapacağız, ulaşım sağlanacak gibi; bunları yapmadılar. Eskiden dört sıra tezgâh vardı, şimdi çok azaldı. Çoğu insan gelemiyor, bu insanlar	IST5, consumer cooperative representative and scholar-activist in Istanbul

	için mesela bir modeli yok bir şey geliştiremiyor	
Halk Bakkal aimed to support the local tradespeople and at the same time provide healthier food to people with low purchasing power through the municipality, but these could not be achieved either. IMM needs to see the problems here and organize a team to solve them.	Halk Bakkal yereldeki esnafı destekleme ve aynı zamanda alım gücü düşük insanlara daha sağlıklı gıdaları belediye üzerinden sağlamak amaçlıydı ama o da sağlanamadı. İBB'nin buralardaki sorunları iyi görmesi ve bunun çözümüne dair ekip oluşturması lazım.	IST5, consumer cooperative representative and scholar-activist in Istanbul
The content of the strategy document is promising, the definitions, even mentioning food sovereignty there is important. But there are no short, medium and long-term plans on how to do it. A timeline can be created for them.	Strateji belgesinde de güzel şeyler yazılmış, tanımlamalar, gıda egemenliğini orada görmek bile önemli fakat nasıl yapılacağına dair kısa, orta ve uzun vadedeki planlar yok, çok geniş düzlemli, nasıl yapılacağına dair çok bir şey yoktu. Onlar bir takvime oturtulabilir.	IST5, consumer cooperative representative and scholar-activist in Istanbul
Democratization efforts		
Participation takes place in the public opinion formation and survey phase, but not in the execution phase. There is a goal of implementing participation in the planning phase, but this is participatory planning and participation is still not achieved in the execution phase in this case. Different actors may take part in the assessment phase, but this is the most primitive form of participation. This is not specific to food-related issues, it is like this for everything.	İcra aşamasında katılım yok, kamuoyu ve anket aşamasında var. Planlama aşamasında Vizyon 2050 bünyesinde katılım hedefi var ama bu katılımcı plan olmuş oluyor, icrada katılım sağlanmış olmuyor. Farklı aktörler de durum tespit aşamasında var olabiliyor ama bu katılımın en ilkel hali. Bu sadece gıda için geçerli değil her kısımda böyle.	IST3, IBB representative
We usually organize workshops at the beginning of big projects. In those workshops, we gather all sector representatives at the same table. We gather the producers, industrialists, NGOs and universities at the same table and tell them: 'We have this kind of plan, what are the contributions you can make, let's get your	Biz genelde büyük projelerin başında bir çalıştay düzenliyoruz. O çalıştaylarda bütün sektör temsilcilerini aynı masanın etrafına koyuyoruz. Üreticiler, sanayiciler, STK'lar, üniversiteleri toplayıp diyoruz ki: "Bizim böyle bir planımız var, ne gibi katkılar sağlayabilirsiniz, sizin düşüncelerinizi	IZM1, IZBB representative

thoughts'. We make sure we get everybody involved.	alalım". Dolayısıyla herkesi işin içine soktuğumuzdan emin oluyoruz.	
We try to take decisions with their subjects as much as possible. Our team is against the 'decision-making on behalf of people' approach that has been used in agriculture so far. All the people in our team are here for a purpose, not simply to be a part of the municipality.	Kararları olabildiğince özneleriyle almaya çalışıyoruz. Ekibimiz tarımda bugüne kadar uygulanan 'adına karar verme' yaklaşımına karşı. Ekibimizin tamamı bir amaç için orada, yoksa belediyede olmak için değil.	IST4, IBB representative
A small amount of the consumer behaviors and demands are reflected on us. There often is a process in which the producer and the consumer transform each other. Producers and cooperatives participate in the decision-making process, but the consumers are not there because we do not have such a connection with them. We have just begun to practice the participation of consumers in the decision-making process via monthly events organized by the market commission."	Tüketici davranış ve taleplerinin çok azı bize yansıyor. Çoğunlukla üreticiyle tüketicinin birlikte birbirlerini dönüştürdükleri bir süreç var. Üretici ve kooperatifler karar aşamasında var ama tüketiciler yok çünkü öyle bir bağımız yok dedi. Ayda bir pazar komisyonunun etkinlik yapmasının sağlanması ile tüketicilerin karar alma sürecine katılmasına yeni başladık.	IST4, IBB representative
There is a market commission, but it doesn't work very well, maybe it should be made operational and the problems that arise in the market should be solved immediately by negotiating with the ISYÖN management. We are also having a hard time finding a respondent from the municipality. The market commission does not own their responsibility and see themselves as an active subject. The decisions related with the producer market has always been top-down and no one asked the market commission to work on something. How do you become an active subject when this is the case?	Bir pazar komisyonu var ama çok işlemiyor, belki işler hale getirilmesi ve pazarda çıkan sorunların anında İSYÖN yönetimiyle görüşülerek çözülmesi lazım. Muhatap bulmakta da zorlanıyoruz. Sahiplenmemiş, kendisini özne olarak görmeyen bir yapıdan bahsediyoruz. Kararlar hep tepeden inme geldi, hiç kimse komisyon bunu çalışsın yapsın demedi yani. Öyle olunca da nasıl özne olacaksın.	IST5, consumer cooperative representative and scholar-activist in Istanbul
The development of a food strategy document by the new local government and the inclusion of consumer initiatives can be	Yeni yerel yönetimin tüketici inisiyatiflerini de içlerine alarak gıda strateji belgesi hazırlaması bir ilk adım	ACA2, Scholar-

seen as a first step. But in connection with giving the initiative to the society, the process is actually top-down. IMM is the subject to implement the determined strategy. There is a problem with changing the subject there.	olarak görülebilir ama orada inisiyatifin topluma verilmesi noktasında süreç yukarıdan aşağıya, İBB bir strateji belirlemiş ve uygulayacak, özne kendisi gibi. Oradaki özneyi tersine çevirebilmek meselesinde sıkıntı var.	activist in Izmir
The municipality published a food strategy document, they were developing it through IPA, but then they started doing it with TEPAV (Economic Policy Research Foundation of Turkey). TEPAV is a representative of the sovereigns and there is no mechanism to solve people's food problem with them. The food strategy document stagnated. The issue we cared the most was the formation of the food council, and they appointed industry representatives there. There are a lot of components, but it also contains industry representatives. People's food policy is not very possible if there are industry representatives. Therefore, I think that the municipality does some of the work just for the sake of doing it.	Bir gıda strateji belgesi yayınladılar, bunu İPA üzerinden yapıyorlardı fakat sonra TEPAV (Türkiye Ekonomi Politikaları Araştırma Vakfı) ile yapmaya döndü. TEPAV dediğimiz egemenlerin temsilcisi bir vakıf ve onlarla halkın gıda sorununun çözülebileceği bir mekanizma yok. Gıda strateji belgesi de öyle kaldı. Bizim en dikkat ettiğimiz konu sonunda oluşturulacak gıda konseyiydi, gıda konseyine de sanayi temsilcileri diye bir şey atamışlar. Bir sürü bileşen var ama bunun içinde sanayi temsilcisi de var. Sanayi temsilcisinin olduğu yerde halktan yana bir gıda politikası çok da mümkün değil. Dolayısıyla belediyenin bazı işleri sırf yapmış olmak için yaptığını düşünüyorum.	IST5, consumer cooperative representative and scholar-activist in Istanbul
When we look at the realities of cooperatives, they may have hesitations about fulfilling the requirements of food sovereignty or agroecology. A systematic effort can be made to overcome these hesitations. The local administrations can be involved in that effort, but it would be valuable to establish a relationship that is based directly on the partners there (an alliance relationship instead of dependency if the local governments are involved) who takes the initiative.	Kooperatiflerin gerçekliklerine baktığımızda gıda egemenliğinin veya agroekolojinin gereklerini yerine getirme konusunda ciddi çekinceleri de olabiliyor. Bunların aşılması için sistematik bir çabanın içine girmek kıymetli olur. O çabanın içinde yerel yönetimler olursa iyi olur ama doğrudan oradaki ortaklara dayanarak yürüyen (yerel yönetimle ilişki kurulacaksa da bağımlılık yerine bir ittifak ilişkisi) ve inisiyatifin onlara bırakıldığı bir ilişki biçiminin kurulması kıymetli olur.	ACA2, Scholar-activist in Izmir

• Farmers cannot exercise participation; the Agriculture Department and consultants from academia try to actualize Tunç Soyer's vision. • The consumers and farmers have no saying/authority in decision-making.	• Çiftçilerin katılımı yok, Tarım Dairesi ve akademiden uyumlu danışmanlar Tunç Soyer'in vizyonunu hayata geçirmeye çalışıyor. • Tüketici, çiftçi söz/ yetki/ karar süreçlerinde yok.	ACA1, Scholar-activist in Istanbul
Ecological production efforts		
If a small ecological producer comes to IBB, we provide compensation for the loss of efficiency by giving priority in the producer market and bringing the products directly to the consumer. When the intermediaries are eliminated, the loss of efficiency can be tolerated with price.	Ekolojik üretim yapan küçük üretici İBB'ye gelirse verim kaybının telafisi pazarda öncelik vererek ve doğrudan tüketiciyle buluşturarak sağlarız. Aracılar ortadan kalkınca fiyatla verim kaybı tolere edilebiliyor.	IST4, IBB representative
The process of cooperativization took place in Izmir starting from the republican period. Therefore, we encounter the first and strongest examples of producer cooperatives here.	Kooperatifleşme süreci Cumhuriyet döneminden başlamak suretiyle İzmir'den gerçekleşmiş. Bu yüzden, üreticilerin bir araya gelerek oluşturdukları kooperatif örneklerinin ilk ve en güçlü örneklerine de burada rastlamak mümkün.	IZM1, IZBB representative
Izmir Metropolitan Municipality already had a movement that focused on agriculture, especially since the period of Aziz Kocaoğlu (the previous mayor), but Tunç Soyer (the current mayor) took it to the next level. He has started 'Another Agriculture is Possible' policy. While eliminating the problems in the existing structures, there are also efforts to protect the manufacturer and to deliver the healthy products to the consumer.	İzmir Büyükşehir Belediyesi'nin geçmişten bu yana, özellikle Aziz Kocaoğlu'ndan itibaren tarım alanında yoğunlaşan bir hareketi vardı. Ama Tunç Soyer tarafından bu hareket arttırıldı ve "Başka Bir Tarım Mümkün" politikasına dönüldü. Mevcut yapıların getirdiği olumsuzluklar biliniyor ve bu olumsuzluklar üzerinde üreticiyi koymak ve aynı zamanda tüketiciye de gıda anlamında sağlıklı ürünler ulaştırmak gibi çalışmalar üzerinde bulunuluyor.	IZM2, IZBB representative
They said they were going to practice soil analysis. For this, a controlled process was going to be operated. Unfortunately, they could not do much analysis this year, however, soil and water analysis are	Toprak analizleri yapacaklarını söylediler. Bunun için de bir kontrollü süreç işletilecekti. Ne yazık ki bu sene çok analiz yapamamışlar halbuki toprak ve su analizleri önemli, bunun temiz üretime	IST5, consumer cooperative representative and scholar-

important in order to differentiate between those who have started ecological farming and those who have not.	geçenle geçmeyeni ayırabilmek adına önemi var.	activist in Istanbul
If we are talking about food sovereignty, the connection with ecology is indispensable, and agroecology is at the center of this. When we look at the actions towards this, we do not see anything worthwhile. Good agriculture and organic agriculture are occasionally supported, but these are not in the focus of the agroecological perspective, rather they are criticized.	Gıda egemenliğinden bahsediyorsak ekolojiyle kurulan bağ olmazsa olmaz, agroekoloji de bunun odağında. Buna yönelik eylemlere bakınca çok dişe dokunur hamleler yapılmadığını görüyoruz. İyi tarım, organik tarıma birtakım destekler zaman zaman veriliyor ama bunlar agroekoloji perspektifinin tam odağında olan şeyler değil, eleştirel baktığı şeyler zaten.	ACA2, Scholar-activist in Izmir
When I think about if the production activities supported by IMM can be linked to food sovereignty, the first thing that comes to my mind is whether to support or not to support agroecological production. As far as I know, there is no such perspective. There may be small examples, but although it is emphasized in the strategy document, agroecology is not at the center.	Halihazırda İBB'nin yaptırdığı üretim faaliyetlerinin de gıda egemenliği ile bağı ne kadar kurulabilir diye düşündüğümde yine aklıma ilk gelen agroekolojik üretimin desteklenmesi veya desteklenmemesi. Orada öyle bir bakış yok diye biliyorum, küçük örnekler olabilir ama strateji belgesinde de vurgulanmasına rağmen odağa konması gibi bir durum yok.	ACA2, Scholar-activist in Izmir
This is a transition stage and clean production cannot happen right away, but during this time inspection is required so that the producers know that they are being inspected. There is no grassroots initiative in the producer market to question the inertia.	Bu bir geçiş aşaması ve bugünden yarına hemen temiz üretim olmaz, 4-5 sene olması gerekir ama bu sürede denetim de yap ki o üretici de bilsin ki denetleniyor. Pazarda bir taban inisiyatifi de yok, o yüzden de ağır aksak ilerliyor ve söylediklerini yapmamış oluyorlar.	IST5, consumer cooperative representative and scholar-activist in Istanbul
Contract farming		
We did not do contract production and we are against it ideologically, but this does not mean that we will not do it in the future. For example, it can be something like making a contract for the eggs obtained from the chicken project and distributing them to the	Sözleşmeli üretim yapmadık ve ideolojik olarak karşıyız. Ama bu ilerde yapmayacağımız anlamına gelmez, mesela tavuk projesiyle elde edilen yumurtalara dair sözleşme yaparak bunları halk bakkallara dağıtmak gibi bir	IST4, IBB representative

public grocers. However, this can be done not in the form of imposition as in contracted production, but in the form of distribution with the method of joint determination and non-profit.	şey olabilir. Ancak bunu sözleşmeli üretimdeki gibi dayatma şeklinde değil, ortak belirleme yöntemiyle ve kâr amacı gütmeden dağıtılması şeklinde yapılabilir.	
In this way, the producers earn a good amount of money and can continue their businesses.	Bu sayede üretici ciddi anlamda parayla buluşuyor ve parasını doğru bir şekilde üretime yönlendirmesini sağlamaya çalışıyoruz.	IZM1, IZBB representative
Theoretical and technical efforts		
We are the pioneers in Turkey in this regard. In addition to being the first agricultural services department, we are one of the municipalities that produce the highest number of projects, share the project results the most and expand the application areas.	Biz bu konuda Türkiye'nin de lokomotifiyiz. İlk kurulan tarımsal hizmetler dairesi başkanlığı olmanın yanı sıra en çok proje üreten ve bu projeleri sonuçlarıyla birlikte en çok paylaşan ve bunun uygulama sahalarını genişleten belediyelerin başında geliyoruz.	IZM1, IZBB representative
Network dynamics		
As far as I understand, IBB does not have close ties with local municipalities.	İBB'nin yerel belediyelerle çok bağları yok anladığım kadarıyla.	IST5, consumer cooperative representative and scholar-activist in Istanbul
We met 4 times with 11 metropolitan cities and 1 non-metropolitan municipality. There is a solidarity with them and a relationship with their cooperatives. When district municipalities call, we accept those who are suitable for the change and transformation we aim for.	11 büyükşehir ve 1 büyükşehir olmayan belediye ile 4 kez toplandık. Onlarla bir dayanışma ve onların kooperatifleriyle ilişkilenme var. İlçe belediyeleri aradıklarında da hedeflediğimiz değişim-dönüşüm sistemine uygun olanları kabul ediyoruz.	IST4, IBB representative
Relations with municipalities were not very lively until the mayorship of Aziz Kocaoğlu. Aziz Kocaoğlu had turned into the region's minister of agriculture.	Aziz Kocaoğlu'nun İzmir'in başına gelmesine kadar belediyelerle olan ilişkiler çok canlı değildi. Aziz Kocaoğlu bölgenin tarım bakanı gibi olmuştu.	IZM3, producer cooperative representative in Izmir

Economic efforts		
We especially aim to increase the added value of the products and the share of small-scale producers. They always lie at the heart of our supports.	Hedefimiz özellikle küçük ölçekli üreticilerin katma değerini ve payını arttırmak. Bütün desteklerimizin odağında onlar var.	IZM1, IZBB representative
The fact that municipalities buying products from cooperatives is a significant support in fierce and competitive market conditions.	Belediyelerin kooperatiflerden ürün alması piyasa şartlarındaki o vahşi yarışta çok ciddi bir destek.	IZM3, producer cooperative representative in Izmir
Tunç Soyer gives enormous support, especially in the marketing of the products.	Tunç Başkan çıtayı daha yukarı koydu özellikle de ürünlerin pazarlanması konusunda.	IZM1, IZBB representative
The key to surviving in the Middle East, where economic and political volatility is high, is doing business internationally. If you export, you will earn more money and if you can keep on exporting you will survive. That's why we are thinking of preparing all our products and manufacturers for export and considering the foreign market rather than the domestic market. For this reason, an export team will be formed and will prepare the products for export. Since Izmir is a port city, it can climb up the ladder in export very quickly.	Orta Doğu gibi ekonomik ve siyasi dalgalanmaların olduğu yerde ayakta kalmanın anahtarı uluslararasına iş yapmak, ihracat. Eğer siz bugün ihracat yaparsanız daha çok para kazanırsınız. İhracatınız süregelirse her zaman ayakta kalırsınız. O yüzden iç pazarı değil, daha çok dış pazarı düşünerek bütün ürünlerimizi ve üreticilerimizi ihracata hazırlamayı planlıyoruz. O yüzden de bir ihracat ekibi oluşacak ve ürünleri ihracata hazırlayacak. Ayrıca bir liman şehri, ihracat basamaklarında çok hızlı yükselebilir.	IZM1, IZBB representative
Izmir Metropolitan Municipality does not care about exporting and making money because they constantly have to support and feed people living there. Izmir Metropolitan Municipality has only one concern: production, organic agriculture, and producing with good agricultural practices. Also feeding the public with the right product and to encourage them to produce.	İzmir Büyükşehir Belediyesi'nin ihracat yapıp para kazanmak gibi bir derdi yok. Çünkü kendi halkına sürekli destekte bulunmak zorunda. Kendi ilini beslemek zorunda. İzmir Büyükşehir Belediyesi'nin tek derdi var, üretim, organik tarım, iyi tarım uygulamasıyla ürün elde etmek. Doğru ürünle halkı beslemek ve halkı üretime özendirmek.	IZM4, producer cooperative representative in Izmir

Adequate infrastructure is required for export. Turkey's export competitiveness to EU countries is very weak. There is a serious decrease in yield due to global climate change. Also due to the customs union agreement, tariffs are high for small products. Therefore, your costs are high. I think rather than focusing on exports, it would be better if the municipalities work on price regulation in the domestic market and supporting the cooperatives.	İhracat için çok ciddi altyapı gerekiyor. Türkiye'nin AB ülkelerine ihracat yapma konusunda rekabet gücü çok zayıf. Küresel iklim değişikliğine bağlı olarak rekoltede ciddi bir düşüş var. Gümrük birliği anlaşmasına bağlı olarak küçük ambalajlı ürünlerde gümrük vergisi yüksek. Dolayısıyla sizin ürünlerinizdeki maliyetleriniz yüksek. Bence belediyeler ihracata yönelmeden ziyade iç piyasada fiyatları regüle etme, kooperatifleri yukarıya çıkarma konusunda çalışır ise daha doğru olur.	IZM3, producer cooperative representative in Izmir
There are 151 villages within Istanbul's boundaries and most of them make a living from agriculture. We want to guarantee farming in Istanbul by ensuring that all of them can make a living from agriculture.	İstanbul bünyesinde 151 tane köy var, bunların birçoğu tarımla geçiniyor. Hepsinin tarımla geçinmesini sağlayarak İstanbul'da tarımın devamlılığını sağlamak istiyoruz.	IST4, IBB representative
Istanbul is our target market. Why? İzmir has everything, there are markets and products everywhere, but Istanbul is different. That is why I attach great importance to the cooperatives in Istanbul. Our very existence is dependent on our relationship with the consumer cooperatives. The growth of business here and the happiness of the farmers depend on these relations.	İstanbul pazarlamada hedef kitlemiz. Niçin? İzmir'de her şey var, her tarafta pazar ve ürün var. Ama İstanbul farklı. Onun için İstanbul'daki kooperatifleri çok önemsiyorum. Bizim var olmamız tüketim kooperatifleriyle olan ilişkiye çok bağlı. Buradaki işlerin büyümesi, çiftçinin mutlu olması bu ilişkilere bağlı.	IZM3, producer cooperative representative in Izmir
There is a vision of transformation with the consumers, and it has already begun. The consumers began to trust and even prefer cooperative products. Until today, our biggest problem was the lack of market, now the market has emerged spontaneously.	Tüketicilerle beraber dönüşüm tahayyülü var, hatta başladı. Tüketici kooperatif ürünlerine güvenmeye başladı, kooperatif ürünlerini tercih ediyor. Bugüne kadar en büyük sıkıntımız pazar sıkıntısıydı, şimdi kendiliğinden pazar oluştu.	IZM4, producer cooperative representative in Izmir
Marketing is part of the strategy in Izmir.	Pazarlama kısmı İzmir'deki stratejinin bir parçası.	ACA1, Scholar-activist in Istanbul

Lack of data		
The lack of data is a great challenge; we are obliged to produce these by ourselves.	Veri eksikliği büyük zorluk, biz üretmek zorunda kalıyoruz.	IST3, IBB representative
The most compelling thing is reaching to data. It is not possible to obtain reliable data from the wholesale market registration system and farmer registration system, and the systems do not talk to each other. It is necessary to go to the field and create the data. We have collected qualitative and quantitative data from Turkish Statistical Institute, agriculture and trade provincial directorates, software companies, academia, the business world and performed interviews in the field.	Hedeflere ulaşmak konusundaki en önemli zorluklardan biri hedef oluşturma aşamasında başlayan veri sorunu. Hal kayıt sistemi ve çiftçi kayıt sisteminden sağlıklı veri çekilemiyor. O verileri birbiriyle konuşturacak bir analiz yapmak imkânsız çünkü sistem öyle bir analiz yapmak üzerine kurgulanmamış. Saha araştırmalarıyla, odak grup görüşmeleriyle bunların yerine geçecek veri oluşturmaya çalışıyoruz.	IST2, IBB representative
We worked on the basis of basins, we investigated how much of which products are produced how efficiently in the districts in the three big basins and which cooperative processes them.	Ciddi bir havza bazında çalışma yaptık, üç büyük havzadaki ilçelerde hangi ürünler ne kadar ve ne verimlilikle üretiliyor, bu ürünleri hangi kooperatif işliyor gibi verileri çıkarttık.	IZM1, IZBB representative
We plan to create a comprehensive data inventory. We want to combine real data with field observations and want all those data to be recorded in the institutional memory. We want to create an agricultural dashboard by mapping.	Veriyle ilgili ciddi bir envanter oluşturmak istiyoruz. Gerçek verileri saha gözlemleriyle de birleştirerek bunların hepsinin kurum hafızasına kaydedilmesini istiyoruz. Haritalandırma yaparak tarım dashboard'u oluşturmak istiyoruz.	IZM1, IZBB representative
Ability to feed itself		
Izmir is a rich province with an extremely high crop and animal production and product diversity.	İzmir gerek bitkisel, gerek hayvansal üretim ve ürün çeşitliliğinin oldukça fazla olduğu zengin bir il.	IZM1, IZBB representative
The food that Istanbul produces in a year can feed its people for approximately one day, while the remaining 364 days are supplied from other places, both inside and outside the country. In the past, Istanbul was fed with fruits and vegetables grown in the inner city bostans and in the surrounding villages.	İstanbul'un 1 yılda ürettiği gıda yaklaşık 1 günlük ihtiyacını karşılar durumda, kalan 364 günlük ihtiyacını ülke içi ve dışı olmak üzere başka yerlerden sağlıyor. İstanbul geçmişte sur içi bostanlarda yetiştirilenler ve çevre köylerde üretilen sebze meyve ile doyuyormuş, sadece et ve	IST4, IBB representative

It was dependent on other places only for meat and wheat. With the strategies of ensuring the continuity of the bostans, the ability of producers to produce, and ensuring that the products come directly to Istanbul from Northern and Southern Thrace via collaboration (this can provide 70-80% of the feeding and also reduce the carbon footprint), Istanbul can be the way it used to be. Although it is not possible for Istanbul to become self-sufficient, it is possible to reduce its dependency in these ways. Traditional agricultural knowledge and seeds are not lost, and we can return to that. Although Istanbul has a limited space, it is symbolically important to do these here and inspire others.	buğdayda dışa bağımlıymış. Bostanların devamlılığının, üreticilerin üretebilir hale gelmesinin ve Kuzey ile Güney Trakya dahil edilerek ortak çalışma ile ürünlerin İstanbul'a doğrudan gelmesinin sağlanması (%70-80 doymasını sağlayabilir ve ayrıca karbon ayak izi azaltılabilir) stratejileri ile geçmişteki gibi bir hale dönülebilir. İstanbul'un kendine yetebilir hale gelmesi mümkün olmasa da bu yollarla bağımlılığını azaltmak mümkün. Gerçek tarım bilgisi ve tohumlar hala kaybolmuş değil ve biz buna dönebiliriz. İstanbul dar bir alan olmasına rağmen sembolik olarak ve ilham verme açısından burada bunları gerçekleştirmek önemli.	
Systemic approach		
I feel like the strategical part is still missing. I think the solutions are acute and acontextual. The solutions are required to be systematized and well-planned. Long-term planning and impact analysis are needed. Instead, the process includes immediate actions more than planned ones.	Bana stratejik kısmı hala eksik geliyor, bağlamsız ve akut çözümler uygulanıyor gibi düşünüyorum dedi. Bunun sistematize edilmesi ve iyi planlanması lazım dedi. Uzun vadeli plan ve etki analizi yapmak gerek dedi. Planlı bir süreçten ziyade anlık müdahalelerle ilerleyen bir süreç gibi.	IST3, IBB representative
We try to build multidisciplinary solutions instead of fragmentary ones.	Parça parça çözümler yerine çok disiplinli çözümler ortaya çıkarmaya çalışıyoruz.	IST2, IBB representative
During Aziz Kocaoğlu's mayorship, there was a model called the Izmir Model in Turkey. Nowadays we stopped hearing it, it has been completely covered up, and the strategy has been based on "Another Agriculture is Possible". Even this, I think, is important in terms of the message it gives. Both differ in terms of implementation as well. Although in some ways the Izmir Model is criticizable (especially in the sense	Aziz Kocaoğlu döneminde Türkiye'de bir İzmir Modeli konuşuluyordu. Şimdi bunun adını hiç duymaz olduk, bunun üzeri tamamen örtüldü ve "Başka Bir Tarım Mümkün" stratejisi üzerinden yürüyor. Bu bile alttan verdiği mesaj açısından bence önemli. Uygulama olarak da bence farklılıklar gösteriyor. Çünkü İzmir Modeli'nde çok eleştirilecek yan olsa da (özellikle ekolojiyle kurduğu bağ	ACA2, Scholar-activist in Izmir

of the connection with ecology), we could still talk about a model. In that model, cooperatives were the focal point (these cooperatives also have a certain historical background, reached a certain strength in terms of institutional power and could establish a cooperative-partner relationship in terms of partnership), and there was a process of buying their products and supporting them. There were direct supports such as seeds, seedlings, saplings and small cattle support for small-scale, disadvantaged family businesses regardless of their affiliation with cooperatives.	açısından) yine bir modelden bahsedebiliyorduk. O modelde odağına daha çok kooperatifleri alan (bu kooperatifler de gerçekten belirli bir tarihselliği olan, kurumsal açıdan belli güce ulaşmış ve ortaklık açısından da kooperatif- ortak ilişkisini tesis edebilmiş), bunlar üzerinden yürüyen bir destekleme ve ürünlerini alıp değerlendirme süreci vardı. Kooperatiflerle bağı olsun olmasın küçük ölçekli, dezavantajlı denilebilecek aile işletmelerine yönelik tohum, fide, fidan, küçükbaş hayvan desteği gibi doğrudan destekler vardı.	
IBB should determinedly deal with issues such as the pollution in Ergene river and deep discharge if they really care about the environment and food. But I don't see any action related with them. There is also the question of how we will live here in the near future. We are as clean as the air we breathe, let alone food, it does not matter whatever you eat as long as we cannot breathe clean air. On top of that, what we eat is poisonous as well.	İstanbul'da temiz çevre diyoruz, Ergene nehri, derin deşarj gibi konuları çok net bir kararlılıkla ele alması lazım eğer temiz çevre, temiz gıda gibi bir derdi varsa. Ama ben buna dair de bir dert göremiyorum. Biz yakın zamanda burada nasıl yaşayacağız meselesi var. Aldığımız hava kadar temiziz, bırak gıdayı temiz havayı alamadığımız sürece ne yersen ye. Yediğin şeyin kendisi de zehirli.	IST5, consumer cooperative representative and scholar-activist in Istanbul
There are also serious problems in connecting with ecology. As a result of the animal husbandry activities carried out in Küçük Menderes, there is a shift towards monoculture and an excessive usage of water as this requires a lot. İZBB, on the other hand, opens a meat integrated facility, a milk processing facility, and engages in activities that will pave the way, while it should suppress animal husbandry there. But then, there is also the step towards transforming the production pattern there by encouraging	Ekolojiyle kurulan bağda da ciddi sıkıntılar var. Küçük Menderes yapılan hayvancılık faaliyetleri sonucu hem bir monokültüre doğru kayış, bir yandan da bunun çok su ihtiyacı da olduğu için su kaynaklarının fazlaca kullanımı söz konusu. İZBB ise oradaki hayvancılığı baskılaması gerekirken et entegre tesisi, süt işleme tesisi açıyor ve önünü açacak faaliyetlere giriyor. Öte yandan oradaki üretim desenini az su isteyen yem bitkilerine özendirerek dönüştürme adımı	ACA2, Scholar-activist in Izmir

forage plants that require less water. From my standpoint, the framework IZBB implements as a policy is far from food sovereignty.	da var. Politika olarak uyguladığı çerçevenin gıda egemenliğinden uzak olduğunu görüyorum.	
Discussion		
Supporting the producer does not automatically mean supporting the consumer.	Üreticiyi desteklemek tüketiciyi desteklemek anlamına gelmiyor.	IST3, IBB representative
There are many things that raise serious doubts on the gap between discourse and reality, sometimes these pass the doubt level by being directly in front of our eyes.	Söylem ve gerçeklik arasında makas olduğuna dair ciddi şüphe doğuran, zaman zaman da şüpheyi geçip doğrudan gözümüzün önünde olan birçok şey var.	ACA2, Scholar-activist in Izmir
I think in the sociological sense it is questionable whether there is a food movement in Turkey at the moment, but it has a base.	Şu anda Türkiye'de sosyolojik anlamıyla toplumsal anlamda gıda hareketi var mı kısmı bence bir soru işareti ama bunun tabanı var.	ACA2, Scholar-activist in Izmir
The biggest problems of Istanbul are increased carbon footprint, its dependency on other places for food, insufficient control over food, people not knowing what they eat despite having the right, and a food consumption that relies on purely coincidental events.	İstanbul'un en büyük sorunları karbon ayak izinin yüksek oluşu, bağımlılık, gıdanın yeterince kontrol edilememesi, insanların hakkı olmasına rağmen ne yediğini bilememesi ve tamamen tesadüflere bağlı bir gıda tüketimi bulunmasıdır.	IST4, IBB representative
Food sovereignty as a concept		
Food sovereignty perspective may not be used due to the necessity of accessing to healthy food.	Sağlıklı gıdaya erişim ihtiyacı olduğu için gıda egemenliği perspektifinden yapılmıyor	ACA1, Scholar-activist in Istanbul
Politicians use food sovereignty in terms of national sovereignty, import-export balance and self-sufficiency.	Siyasetçiler gıda egemenliğini ulusal egemenlik çerçevesinde, ithalat- ihracat dengesi ve kendine yeterlilik anlamında kullanıyor.	ACA1, Scholar-activist in Istanbul
Conceptually, food sovereignty remained latent for a long time. The concept is mostly circulated through ÇİFTÇİ-SEN in Turkey. ÇİFTÇİ-SEN has limited opportunities in terms of accessing and organizing people. In	Gıda egemenliği kavramsal olarak uzun süre örtük kaldı. Kavramın Türkiye'de daha çok ÇİFTÇİ-SEN kanalıyla dolaşıma sokulduğunu gördük. Orada da örgütlenme açısından yetebildiği ve	ACA2, Scholar-activist in Izmir

the upcoming period, there will be efforts especially about the "Declaration on the Rights of Peasants" that is approved by the UN. This type of activity will perhaps bring the cooperatives in İzmir closer to food sovereignty in the future.	yetemediği yer var ÇİFTÇİ-SEN'in. Önümüzdeki dönemde özellikle BM'de onaylanan "Köylü Hakları Bildirgesi" üzerinden çabaları olacak. Bu tip bir faaliyet önümüzdeki dönemde belki İzmir'deki kooperatifleri de gıda egemenliğine daha çok yaklaştıracaktır.	
• Food sovereignty has started to be used out of context after Covid. • Even though İZBB's uses food sovereignty, nothing has been done to develop a holistic policy. • Food sovereignty concept has a radical perspective, and it should be considered and applied as such.	• Covid sonrası bağlamından uzak bir biçimde kullanılmaya başlandı. • Gıda egemenliği İZBB'nin ağzından çıksa da bunu bütünlüklü bir politika haline getirmek için yapılan bir şey yok. • Kavramın radikal bir perspektifi var ve böyle düşünülüp uygulanması gerek.	ACA2, Scholar-activist in Izmir
• Food sovereignty is a very dynamic concept; it has come to this day by making expansions. The International Planning Committee on Food Sovereignty has been preparing to connect the concept with the labor, ecology and women's movement. If we draw the framework here and say whether there is a food sovereignty perspective in İzmir, personally I can clearly answer as "no". But if we ask if there is any action on this, I'm sure they can mention many things including the president of İZBB. The actions have started to become a bit mixed in İzmir.	• Gıda egemenliği çok dinamik bir kavram, açılımlar yaparak bugüne geldi. International Planning Committee on Food Sovereignty emek, ekoloji ve kadın hareketiyle kavramın bağını kurmak için hazırlıkta. Çerçeveyi buradan çizersek ve İzmir'de bir gıda egemenliği bakışı var mı dersek kendi adıma çok net bir şekilde "yok" cevabını verebiliyorum. Ama buna yönelik bir çalışma var mı diye sorsak eminim ki İZBB başkan da dahil olmak üzere birçok şey sayacaklardır. Bu İzmir'de biraz ortaya karışık bir hal almaya başladı.	ACA2, Scholar-activist in Izmir
The absence of food sovereignty in Izmir's producer cooperatives might be related with the satisfaction of them with their existing structures. There is no perspective about representing social, cultural, political and economic rights of the producers. There is the corporatization of cooperatives. There are positive steps in terms of local development model, but when we put the	İzmir'deki üretici kooperatiflerinin mevcut yapıları itibariyle yeterli geldiği için gıda egemenliği geçmiyor olabilir. Biz üretici örgütüyüz, sosyal, kültürel, politik, ekonomik haklarını temsil ediyoruz gibi bir perspektif yok. Kooperatifler şirketleşmiş durumda. Yerel kalkınma modeli açısından pozitif şeyler var ama gıda egemenliği filtresini	ACA1, Scholar-activist in Istanbul

food sovereignty filter, we see that there is no participation.	koyunca katılımcılığın olmadığını görüyoruz.	
The reasons for the lack of the concept of food sovereignty in İzmir may be as follows: • Since Tunç Soyer follows the "Slow food" movement, they developed a discourse based on it. Slow food has little to do with food sovereignty. • In Turkey, food sovereignty spread upon ÇİFTÇİ-SEN. It has recently started to be used and become widespread around cooperatives and ÇİFTÇİ-SEN.	Gıda egemenliği kavramının İzmir'de olmayışının nedenleri şöyle olabilir: • Tunç Soyer "Slow food" hareketini takip ettiği için bunun üzerinden söylem geliştiriyorlar. Slow food'un da gıda egemenliği ile pek ilişkisi yok. • Gıda egemenliği ÇİFTÇİ-SEN kaynaklı geliştiği için yeni yeni kullanılmaya başlandı ve kooperatifler ile ÇİFTÇİ-SEN etrafında yaygınlaştı.	ACA1, Scholar-activist in Istanbul
Under the strategy of "Another Agriculture is Possible", we see that IZBB has taken many steps towards corporate farming, which has no place in food sovereignty. Here, the concepts of the corporate farming such as start-ups, technoparks, hydroponic and vertical farming emerge which has nothing to do with food sovereignty.	"Başka Bir Tarım Mümkün" stratejisi altında, hiç gıda egemenliğinde yeri olmayan şirket tarımı dediğimiz konuda birçok adım attığını görüyoruz. Buralarda tam da şirket tarımı dediğimiz dünyanın kavramları start-up'lar, teknoparklar, topraksız tarım, dikey tarım gibi şeyler işin içine giriyor ki bu adımların gıda egemenliği ile hiç alakası yok.	ACA2, Scholar-activist in Izmir
It should not only function as a producer's market, but also as a social center. There should be workshops, people should be able to learn about the adventure of food, listen, and talk directly to the producer. It is not just about commerce. Two years have passed and meanwhile the diversity and richness of the market have shrunk, and the municipality is not concerned about this. It is not about just showing an area and saying producers can open a market there. There are a lot of difficulties, but I think the municipality does not want to face them.	Orası sadece bir üretici pazarı değil, aynı zamanda bir sosyal merkez gibi de çalışmalı. Gelen kişi için orada atölye olmalı, gıdanın başka serüvenini öğrenebilmeli, dinlemeli, doğrudan üreticiyle konuşmalı. Meselemiz sadece ticaret değil yani. 2 sene geçti, bu süre içinde pazarın çeşitliliği, zenginliği biraz küçüldü ve karşımızda bunu dert eden bir belediye yok. Mesele sadece alan gösterip gelin burada pazar açın demek değil yani. Bunun bir sürü zorlukları var, bununla yüzleşme gibi bir durumun olmadığını düşünüyorum.	IST5, consumer cooperative representative and scholar-activist in Istanbul
State vs. Local governments		

Of course, local governments cannot achieve it alone. The involvement of metropolitan municipalities in the agricultural policies after the adoption of metropolitan municipality law created a dichotomy. Sometimes we see that the central government and local governments conflict with each other in the field. This is not plausible from a political point of view. I do not think that İZBB has the power in terms of its workforce and other resources to bring food sovereignty, but I observe that they do not intend to.	Sadece yerel yönetimlerle olacak iş değil tabii. Büyükşehir kanunu sonrası tarım politikasına dahil olması bir ikilik yarattı. Merkezi yönetim ve yerel yönetimlerin sahada zaman zaman çatışır pozisyona geldiklerini görüyoruz. Bu çok doğru değil politika açısından. İZBB'nin işgücü ve diğer kaynakları açısından bunu sağlayacak güçte olduğunu da düşünmüyorum ama niyetinin de oraya çok tekabül etmediğini ben gözlemliyorum.	ACA2, Scholar-activist in Izmir
Agriculture cannot be a policy of the political parties; it has to be the state policy.	Tarım parti politikası olamaz, devlet politikası olmak zorunda.	IZM4, producer cooperative representative in Izmir
In my opinion, there are a handful of people in the management who want to do something, but the teams at the lower level have different political opinions. Therefore, it seems that there is a sort of blockage.	Benim gördüğüm tepede bir avuç insan var, bir şey yapmak istiyor ama altyapıdaki ekipler başka siyasetten. Dolayısıyla onlar taş koyuyorlar gibi bir durum var benim anladığım.	IST5, consumer cooperative representative and scholar-activist in Istanbul
IMM's desire for transformation is present from the first person to the bottom, and the team working on this business is very harmonious. It makes the bureaucratic side of the job easier.	İBB'nin dönüşüm arzusu baştaki kişiden en aşağıya kadar mevcut ve bu işle ilgili çalışan ekip çok uyumlu. İşin bürokratik yanını kolaylaştırıyor.	IST4, IBB representative
I think that the people in the management have good intentions, but they are not honest about the setbacks in the implementation. When we ask about the reasons behind failing, we receive superficial answers. Either they can be honest, not give false hope and study its feasibility first, or if something	Baştaki kişilerin niyet olarak dert edindiğini fakat uygulamaya gelince oradaki aksaklıkların ne olduğu konusunda açık olmadıklarını düşünüyorum. Biz bu neden yapılmadı dediğimizde elimizde yok bu olmuyor gibi cevaplar alıyoruz. Ya oralarda açık olmak ve yapamayacağın sözü vermemek,	IST5, consumer cooperative representative and scholar-activist in Istanbul

defective has been done I think it is necessary to make an effort to improve it.	yapılabilirliğini önce etüt etmek lazım ya da bir şey yapılıp ortaya çıktıysa bunun daha iyisini yapmak için çaba sarf edilmesi gerektiğini düşünüyorum.	
On one hand, the hegemonic mentality has severe sanctions against the municipality's team. But while the promises they gave were very good in the beginning, the current situation is far from what they promised.	Bir yandan egemen zihniyetin de onlara karşı çok ciddi yaptırımları var. Ama başta verdikleri sözler çok iyiyken, geldikleri nokta başta söylenen nokta değil.	IST5, consumer cooperative representative and scholar-activist in Istanbul
I feel gratitude for our mayors, they are working well despite all the political repression. The municipality is doing its best with the limited opportunities and cannot do anything beyond that.	Ben belediye başkanlarımıza şükranla bakıyorum, baskıya rağmen iyi çalışıyorlar. Belediye elindeki sınırlı imkanlarla yapıyor yapacağını, bunun ötesinde de bir şey yapamaz.	IZM4, producer cooperative representative in Izmir
Food is actually not incumbent on the municipalities, but they had to help due to the circumstances. But they cannot do this alone. The macro policy of the state should be in favor of the farmer and consumer, businesses that care about clean food. The state will be the guide, they will have the macro policies.	Gıda belediyelerin işi de değil ama şartlar öyle gerektirdi ki belediyeler bu işe yardım etmek zorunda kaldı. Bunu tek başınıza yapamazsınız. Devletin makro politikası çiftçiden, tüketiciden yana; sofraya zehirli gıda gelmeyecek, gıda güvenliğini tesis edecek işletmelere destek olmaktan geçiyor. Siz yol gösterici olacaksınız, makro politikalarınız olacak.	IZM3, producer cooperative representative in Izmir