

Multi-stakeholder Policy

Formulation and Action Planning for Sustainable Urban Agriculture Development



Marielle Dubbeling and Henk de Zeeuw
ETC Urban Agriculture

With contributions from
T. Otchere Larbi, IWMI-Ghana,
G. Merzthal and A. Santandreu, IPES

Working Paper 1

The RUAF Working Paper Series

The Resource Centres on Urban Agriculture and Food Security (RUAF), in the Cities Farming for the Future (CFF) Programme, facilitate joint learning within the RUAF partnership and share experiences with others interested in the subject.

The working paper series have the following aim:

- ❖ to facilitate exchange and systematisation of the experiences;
- ❖ to improve and further develop existing RUAF working materials (like the training materials developed at the start of the CFF programme) on the basis of the lessons learnt during implementation and by integrating materials developed in the regions;
- ❖ to prepare step by step a final product of RUAF-CFF.

The RUAF working papers represent important aspects of the RUAF approach, which cover the main elements of the process of Multi-stakeholder Policy formulation and Action Planning (MPAP) and major RUAF focus themes

The documents focus on mid level staff of organisations interested to engage in urban agriculture and MPAP-process as a organiser or facilitator, a working group or forum member, a trainer, etcetera and development organisations and universities active in this field. For some of the working papers there might be additional specific audiences.

This is the first Working Paper in this series.



© PO Box 64, 3830 AB Leusden, The Netherlands
Tel: +31-33-4326039, Fax: +31-33 4940791
Email: ruaf@etcnl.nl, Website: www.ruaf.org

Multi-stakeholder Policy Formulation and Action Planning for Sustainable Urban Agriculture Development

Marielle Dubbeling and Henk de Zeeuw
ETC Urban Agriculture

With contributions from
T. Otchere Larbi, IWMI-Ghana,
G. Merzthal and A. Santandreu, IPES



Working Paper Series

This paper is based on earlier texts and training materials developed by ETC Urban Agriculture/RUAF and their partners; as well as on RUAF partner progress reports.

Multi-stakeholder Policy Formulation and Action Planning in the Cities Farming for the Future Programme

Urban agriculture is a dynamic concept that comprises a variety of livelihood systems, ranging from subsistence production and processing at household level to fully commercialised agriculture. It takes place in different locations and occurs under varying socio-political conditions and policy regimes. Urban agriculture can make important contributions to social, economic and ecological objectives of sustainable urban development.

Attention to urban agriculture is increasing though in cities in the North as well as in the South, and the number of cities revising existing policies or formulating new policies and action programmes on urban agriculture is growing rapidly. New rules and regulations are required to enhance the potential of agriculture in the cities and mitigate its potential risks. The challenge is for urban agriculture to become part of sustainable urban development and to be valued as a social, economic and environmental benefit rather than a liability.

When a government collaborates – from as early a stage as possible – with citizens, farmers, civil organisations, private sector companies and other governmental entities in the preparation, implementation and evaluation of policies and related action plans, we can speak of participatory and Multi-stakeholder Policy formulation and Action Planning (MPAP). For sustainable urban agriculture development, such multi-stakeholder participation is particularly important, since it involves a large diversity of systems and related actors (e.g. input providers, vegetable producers, fish or livestock farmers, micro-entrepreneurs, middlemen and vendors), and touches on a large number of urban management areas (e.g. land use planning, environmental and waste management, economic development, public health, social and community development, housing programmes and management of parks and green structures).

Multi-stakeholder processes are increasingly considered an important element of processes of policy design, action planning and implementation. Under the Cities for the Future Programme, MPAP processes are being facilitated by the RUAF partners in 20 so-called pilot cities around the world. Each MPAP is characterised by:

- ❖ the participation of a variety of non-governmental actors in policy making and action planning,
- ❖ who are given an equal chance to contribute to the preparation, implementation and evaluation of a policy and related action plans
- ❖ in an open and transparent process,
- ❖ in which the final decisions taken honour – to the greatest extent possible – the contributions from the various actors involved.

This first working paper gives an overview of lessons learned under the Cities Farming for the Future programme with MPAPs. It discusses the importance of interactive and participatory processes of policy formulation and action planning, presents the MPAP process and the different steps to be taken, and highlights lessons learned thus far by RUAF partners and several other organisations. In subsequent working papers the elements of the MPAP will be dealt with in more detail.



Grant Park in Chicago (photo: Bert Lof).

THE RUAF FOUNDATION

The RUAF Foundation is an international network of 8 Resource Centres on Urban Agriculture and Food Security (7 regional and 1 global one: see on the back page). The RUAF network was formed in 1999. The RUAF partners share a common vision on the role of urban and periurban agriculture in urban poverty reduction and enhancing food security a/o and together implement the international RUAF programme.

The RUAF Foundation aims to contribute to urban poverty reduction and local economic development, enhanced urban food security and to stimulate participatory city governance and improved urban environmental management, by creating enabling conditions for the development of sustainable urban and periurban agriculture.

They seek to do so by capacity development of local stakeholders, strengthening local producers' organisations and facilitating the integration of urban agriculture in policies and action programmes of local governments, civic society organisations and private enterprises.

In the first phase of the RUAF programme (**RUAF I**, 1999-2004) the emphasis was on networking, awareness raising, documentation of experiences, stimulating exchange and debate, and establishment of regional resource centres on urban agriculture. The increasing capacity and development of the RUAF network resulted in March 2005 in the legal establishment of an independent organisation, the RUAF Foundation.

In the second phase of RUAF, the **Cities Farming for the Future programme** (RUAF-CFF, 2005-2008), the focus has shifted to development of regional training and planning capacities and facilitating multi-stakeholder policy making and action planning. The RUAF-CFF activities are taking pace in 20 pilot cities in 15 countries.

The main strategies applied by the RUAF-CFF programme are:

- ❖ Establishment a Multi stakeholder platform on urban agriculture and food security in each of the 20 pilot cities, that coordinates the formulation and implementation of a Municipal Policy and/or Strategic Action Plan on Urban Agriculture with active participation of urban producers (men and women)
- ❖ Enhancing the regional capacity to deliver gender sensitive training on urban agriculture and multi-stakeholder planning of policies and projects on urban agriculture has been enhanced
- ❖ Enabling that the organisation and institutions involved in the Multi-stakeholder Platforms use participatory and gender sensitive methods for situation diagnosis, planning and monitoring and evaluation;
- ❖ Improving access of various categories of local stakeholders to information on urban and periurban agriculture that is well adapted to their needs.
- ❖ Consolidation of the seven regional Resource centres on Urban Agriculture and Food Security (RUAF's) and strengthening their capacities to provide information, training and advice on urban agriculture in their region.
- ❖ Promoting gender mainstreaming in urban agriculture is being promoted by all RUAF partners

In the next phase of the RUAF programme, titled "**From Seed to Table**" (RUAF-FSTT, 2009-2010) the processes set in motion in the pilot cities during RUAF-CFF will be continued with a specific focus at strengthening urban producer organisations and enhancing their capacities to engage in participatory technology development, micro-enterprise development (in production and processing), marketing and chain development.

Main funding organisations of the RUAF programme are DGIS (the Netherlands) and IDRC (Canada).

MPAP: what and who?

“Our municipal administration assumed from the start the challenge to fight against poverty and create new policies and programmes based on consultative, participatory and democratic processes of policy formulation. The policies and programmes developed respond to the needs expressed by the population such as hunger, environmental degradation, analphabetism and urban violence. One of the programmes created constitutes the Hunger Zero programme. A sub-department of urban agriculture was also created with the objective to promote urban agriculture in the municipality. I would like to reaffirm our commitment to keep working together with our citizens, community based organisations, public and private institutes to continue working towards further development and modernisation of urban agriculture to improve our municipality and most importantly the quality of life and well-being of its population” (Dr. Washington Ipenza Pacheco, Mayor of Villa Maria del Triunfo, Lima-Peru, 1998-2006. Translated from Villa María-sembrando para la vida, 2006).

If a participatory and multi-stakeholder approach is chosen, urban agriculture action plans and policies are thus formulated in collaboration with and in open interaction between local government and all other relevant stakeholders that have a “stake” in urban and peri-urban agriculture: different types of urban farmers, CBO’s, NGO’s, Municipal departments, Governmental organisations, credit institutions, private enterprises, etcetera. This collaboration goes beyond processes of mere consultation, where stakeholders are asked for their feedback on an already defined line of action. Instead, in MPAP, stakeholders are given the opportunity and are stimulated to participate in the definition of problems/ potential opportunities and related policy issues and are invited to propose possible solutions or lines of action as well as define their potential roles in implementation.

MPAP is thus characterised by:

- ❖ the participation of both governmental and a variety of non-governmental actors in joint policy making and action planning (some refer to this process as a strategic planning),
- ❖ who are given an equal chance to contribute to the preparation, implementation and evaluation of a policy and related action plans
- ❖ in an open and transparent process,
- ❖ in which the final decisions taken honour –to the greatest extent possible – the contributions from the various actors involved.

For sustainable urban and peri-urban agriculture development, such multi-stakeholder participation is particularly important, since (peri)urban agriculture involves a large diversity of systems and related actors (e.g. input providers, vegetable producers, fish or livestock farmers, micro-entrepreneurs, middlemen and vendors) and touches on a large number of urban management areas (e.g. land use planning, environmental and waste management, economic development, public health, social and community development, housing programmes and management of parks and green structures).



A seminar on urban agriculture (photo: Ivana Cristina Lovo).

MPAP: why?

It is clear that choosing to pursue more participatory and multi-stakeholder processes of policy formulation and action planning will present a challenge to many cities, and it has several advantages as well as disadvantages compared to more traditional forms of policy formulation.

MPAP has – in principle and compared to other approaches – the following benefits:

- ❖ It contributes to more participatory governance, public-private partnerships and helps bridge the gap/overcome distrust between citizen groups and the government;
- ❖ It allows for better situation analysis and quality decision making (through a better understanding of priority issues and the needs of different stakeholders involved and a better linking of different sources of knowledge, information and expertise);
- ❖ It improves the likelihood of success and sustainability of implementation (through enhanced acceptance and ownership of the policy formulated, improved mechanisms and processes for coordination, and mobilising and pooling of scarce human, technical and financial resources) (Hemmati, 2002);
- ❖ It supports improvement of the problem-solving capacities of the participating institutions (Partners and Propper, 2004).

On the other hand, public participation in decision-making and action planning:

- ❖ Requires skilled human resources and additional financial means;
- ❖ May require more time than other approaches to allow for required changes in institutional cultures;
- ❖ May lead to an undue increase in the influence of some stakeholders (especially when there is a lack of transparency throughout the process).

Different experiences and evaluations point out that the appreciation for and the results of MPAP can be disappointing if not properly managed. The main causes often mentioned are insufficient preparation and planning of the process, insufficient embedding of the process in participating institutions and lack of transparency and communication throughout the process.

Despite increasing attention for MPAP, few municipal authorities and other local stakeholders have experience with these processes (especially in regard to urban agriculture). They therefore require well-designed methods and tools, technical assistance and staff training. Lessons learned from the RUA partners will be presented, and their recommendations on how to effectively organise MPAP will be given and illustrated below, in an attempt to help interested stakeholders in setting up and developing an MPAP in their own city.

Lessons learned regarding MPAP

ROOM FOR ALTERNATIVE VIEWS?

Before starting an MPAP, one should reflect first on the question of whether there is sufficient room for new ideas, plans and actions that deviate from the current dominant views and style of operation of the local government and the other organisations involved. In other words: is there really room to develop plans and policies together, are actors in the process prepared to change their initial ideas and styles of working based on inputs provided by other actors, are they prepared and committed to implement the outcomes of the participatory process? Is there sufficient trust among the different stakeholders? Is the government involved willing to cede part of its “power” and allow for public participation in policy making? If not, further awareness should be raised on the benefits (and costs) of MPAP. In fact, a paradigm shift in thinking about and planning of city development is required. To ensure that the benefits of participatory decision making processes are widely understood, accepted and –on a longer term- integrated in routine application, steady and progressive changes in institutional structures and organisational behaviour is required. Spaces for participation should be created and formalised. Special consideration will need to be given to facilitate participation of the non-organised and often excluded segments of the population (women, immigrants and youth, for example). Creating such awareness on as well as commitment to participate in an MPAP and implement its results is crucial at the start of –and throughout- any MPAP process and –as is the experience of RUAF- requires time, patience, regular consultations (through office visits and telephone calls) and a combination of formal and informal working relations. Such initial commitment may however also need to be taken into account in criteria for city selection as to decide in which city a programme, promoting an MPAP approach, will work.

Preparing for active participation

The stakeholders involved in MPAP may need training in how to work together with people they have never worked with before, as well as requires training in participatory processes and principles, such as team building, conflict management, project cycle management and leadership training. Also training in action planning and policy formulation will be required. For example, urban producers may need to learn to lobby and negotiate with different levels of government and other external agencies to achieve their goals. Urban farmers are often not at all or only loosely

organised and rarely participate in representative bodies. Hence, in order to get the urban farmers, and especially poorer and female farmers, involved in participatory policy formulation and action planning processes, special efforts are needed to get them actively involved. Informal farmer groups and leaders have to be identified. Existing farmer groups have to be brought into contact with each other, special “focus group meetings” have to be organised to analyse the farmers’ situation and interests / perspectives (see also below “Situation analysis”) and to prepare their proposals for the policy formulation process. Moreover, continued leadership training focused on strengthening the existing farmer groups and their strategic development planning is required. In Villa Maria del Triunfo-Lima, Peru for example, one key factor for the success of the MPAP constituted the creation and formalization of a Villa Maria urban producers’ network, formed by 570 producer families.

IMPORTANCE OF ORGANISATION

The MPAP process should be well organised with a clear time-schedule, division of labour, and agreements on how and when participation in policy formulation will take place (for example in quarterly forum meetings), and how monitoring of progress and results will take place. It is important to work with a committed and capable facilitating/coordinating team that has skills in conflict mediation, resolution and facilitation. Some funding is required for organising meetings and information sharing. Minutes on discussions held, agreements made and results obtained should for example be shared among all stakeholders to continuously build trust, cooperation and commitment.

Building openness and mutual respect

Open and transparent communication and decision-making procedures are important, while all participants should have an “open eye and ear” for differences in the interests and “cultures” of the different stakeholders. Mutual understanding and respect should be seen as a basis for dialogue and negotiation.

Well-selected stakeholders

It is important to identify which stakeholders should be involved in the MPAP process (see also the section below on “stakeholder identification and analysis”). To be effective, the policy should include all institutions, organisations and



Discussion on urban agriculture programme at Accra Metropolitan Assembly (photo: Theophilus Otchere-Larbi).

groups that have a “stake” in the issues that will be attended by this policy: categories of the population affected by this policy, organisations with a regulatory mandate or with relevant technical knowledge, etc. In the Netherlands, for example, the development of a municipal plan seeking to combine agricultural production in the peri-urban area with water storage, recreation, a natural park or other functions would require the involvement of the peri-urban farmers, the water board, the municipality, the province, local nature conservation organisations, community organisations and others (Deelstra et al., 2006). Stakeholder identification will thus depend on the local context (by identifying for example who is responsible for land use planning or water management: the local or national government; the department for planning, for parks and gardens, for housing; a public, semi-public or private organisation or water board), but is also dependent on the types of urban agriculture found in the city. Generally other actors are involved in livestock farming, processing and marketing (the livestock farmers, a slaughter-house,

a cheese-processing unit for example) when compared to for example horticulture production and marketing. Also, actors involved in intra-urban agriculture will differ from those involved in peri-urban agriculture, the latter often being of a larger scale and more commercial nature. It is for this reason that RUAF has advanced in the development of a typology of Urban Agriculture systems (see further below participatory farming system analysis) each with its specific characteristics, problems, potentials and support needs.

Need for clarity on expected results and decision-making procedures

There should be clarity, from the very beginning of the process, regarding the results expected from a MPAP and what will be done with these results. Where could an MPAP, considering a certain time-period, realistically lead to in a given local situation? Will the main result be the formulation and adoption of a Strategic Agenda for urban agriculture development. To what extent will it be possible to advance in the formulation and adoption of revised or

new bye-laws or regulations, or in the setting up of new institutional programmes or units? This will amongst others depend on the level and types of decisions that can be taken by the local government (and thus on the level of decentralisation) or on the time-period left before the next municipal elections. Additionally, it will be important to clarify how and by whom the formal decisions regarding adoption and implementation of proposed policies and action plans will be taken. In Bulawayo (Zimbabwe), for example, a multi-stakeholder forum on urban agriculture (supported by RUAF's partner MDP) developed a city action plan on urban agriculture as part of the MPAP process. The forum recommendations were presented to one of the Municipal Council Committees that reviewed the proposal (and adapted it where necessary to the legal/institutional framework in place) and subsequently presented the plan to the full Municipal Council, responsible for taking the final decisions, formalising the plan, making a budget available, etc. A Bulawayo policy on urban agriculture has now been formulated and various urban agriculture projects are being implemented and supported by the Municipality, as well as several of the other stakeholders involved in the MPAP (see for further information the attached case study on Bulawayo).

Early implementation

Implementation of some initial actions at local level in an early stage of the process that produce concrete outputs with good visibility within a short period of time will help to reinforce the commitment and participation of those involved, especially the farmers and other intended beneficiaries, and create a positive environment for more complex and long-term processes. The implementation of a demonstration community garden in Villa Maria del Triunfo-Lima, Peru, implemented at the start of the MPAP

process, helped to motivate both the local government and urban farmers to participate/continue participating in the MPAP and helped to set up and strengthen an urban farmer organisation. The organisation proved to be a crucial partner in later stages of the MPAP, for example in their lobbying for continued local government support once a new Mayor was elected. The organisation is now participating in the city's participatory budgeting process, where citizens have a say in decision-making regarding expenditure of part of the public funds.

Shared budgeting; building on available resources

To be able to implement the policies and plans that will result from the MPAP, an early start has to be made in generating the required financial and human resources. The experiences to date indicate that it is crucial to first build on the means available in the organisations and institutions participating in the process through joint budgeting and inclusion of priority actions in their institutional programmes and annual operational plans and budgets. For example, the early inclusion of urban agriculture in the municipal budget of Rosario (Argentina) was an essential factor in the implementation of the priority actions identified in the multi-stakeholder process (training, marketing support, etc.) and the success of the municipal urban agriculture programme. Dependence on external (project) funding only will severely limit, delay or even inhibit the possibility of implementing the developed action plans, leading on its turn to conflicts, distrust, de-motivation and finally a break-up of the entire process. It has shown to be very important to provide as much clarity as possible on the expected contributions of each stakeholder, as –logically- some stakeholders only expect monetary benefits in turn for their personal and institutional participation.

The MPAP process: step by step

The main output of a MPAP is the joint development of a City Strategic Agenda on urban and peri-urban agriculture. The Agenda will have to be operationalised into a series of operational plans regarding the design/ planning of the various projects prioritized in the Strategic Agenda as well as the revision or development of new norms, bye-laws and regulations on (peri)urban agriculture.

The degree to which the Agenda will be operationalised and implemented, is –as stated earlier– dependent on local conditions and the set time-frame. The experience in Accra, Ghana shows for example that expected changes in policy and institutionalisation could not be achieved within the first 2 years of implementation. The first two years were basically needed to create awareness and establish the basis for policy change (by developing the Strategic Agenda). It is only now, in the third year, that bye-laws on urban agriculture are actually being revised and that changes are made in land use plans, integrating and zoning urban agriculture as a legitimate land use in certain areas in the city (see for further information the attached case study on Accra).

To better illustrate the MPAP process, the different phases or steps as applied by the RUAF partners will be presented. The RUAF partners are currently assisting 20 cities around the world in the development of MPAP processes on urban agriculture. This working paper will refer mainly to the experiences generated in the first series of 10 cities where these processes were implemented.

The MPAP on urban agriculture is built around the following phases:

a) **Preparatory activities, forming a programme management committee as well as local MPAP facilitating team and developing a work plan:** identification of the municipality (or municipal division/department) that will be selected as a focus area for the MPAP; broad consultations involving the full range of local stakeholders; setting up of the programme management committee and local MPAP facilitating or core team; coming to a basic agreement between participating institutions and actors on communication strategies and working procedures; training and preparation of a detailed work plan for the situation analysis.



Analysing urban agriculture in Lima (photo: IPES).

- b) **Situation analysis:** review of secondary data, stakeholder inventory and analysis, mapping of existing agricultural land use as well as identification and characterisation of available open spaces, participatory analysis of the problems and potentials of the main urban farming systems and a critical review of existing policies, norms, regulations and actual policy framework. To some extent, the local and regional economic, political and funding environment will also be analysed.
- c) **Broadening commitment and setting the Agenda:** in this phase an adequate institutional framework for development of a City Strategic Agenda on urban agriculture is put in place and such an Agenda is formulated.
- d) **Operationalisation:** this phase includes the participatory design, budgeting and planning of pilot projects, (re-)formulation of norms, bye-laws, plans and regulations on urban agriculture and their integration in institutional programmes and budgets.
- e) **Implementation, monitoring, adaptation/innovation:** implementation, monitoring of the process and results, feedback and adaptation/innovation.

Please find a visual representation of this process and the expected results of each of the phases in the figure and table on the next page.

Figure 1: Steps in the MPAP




Table 1: Phases and their expected results of the MPAP process

Phase	I Preparatory activities	II Situation analysis	III Broadening institutional commitment and setting the Agenda	IV Operationalisation	V Implementation, monitoring and innovation
Results/ outputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❶ Selection of Municipality (and municipal division or department) where the MPAP will be implemented ❷ Programme management committee and local MPAP facilitating team formed, detailed work plan elaborated, communication, participation and monitoring strategies defined ❸ Policy awareness seminar implemented ❹ Key actors trained and situation analysis planned ❺ Basic agreement by local government and other key actors to embark on a MPAP and commitments formalised 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❶ Rapid analysis of existing information implemented ❷ A stakeholder inventory implemented ❸ A review of current policies and policy framework policy implemented ❹ Land use map elaborated ❺ A rapid appraisal on main urban farming systems ❻ A policy narrative elaborated, to serve as basis for development of the City Strategic Agenda 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❶ Institutional Commitment ❷ Multi-stakeholder Forum on urban agriculture set up ❸ A City Strategic Agenda on UA formulated 	Operational plans elaborated for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❶ specific projects ❷ (re)formulation of norms, bye-laws, plans and regulations ❸ integration of urban agriculture into institutional programmes and budgets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❶ Projects implemented ❷ Norms, bye-laws, plans and regulations (re)formulated ❸ Urban agriculture integrated in municipal and institutional programmes and annual budgets ❹ Results, outcomes and impacts monitored and lessons learned ❺ Existing strategies adapted and new ones put in place

PHASE 1: PREPARATORY ACTIVITIES

City selection

To be able to select suitable partner cities where a MPAP will be implemented, RUAF partners collect general information on: general socio-economic and political-institutional data on the city; general information on urban agriculture in the city (agro-ecological conditions, what types of (peri)urban agriculture can be found in the city, what is the current city policy on urban agriculture, what projects on urban agriculture have been or are being implemented?) as well as information on potential MPAP partners (who are key stakeholders in urban agriculture and who are good contact persons; what organisational expertise is available in urban agriculture, in participatory action-research, in policy design and project formulation, are potential key stakeholders committed to implementing a MPAP process etc). Potential city partners could also be asked to prepare a “City Dossier” providing the information needed. If a competitive selection has to be made among various potential partner cities, the City Dossiers could also be used for this purpose. In this context city selection criteria include a.o: presence of and potential for urban agriculture; presence of good potential MPAP partners; initial local government interest and commitment to participating in and contributing to a MPAP on urban agriculture; remaining period before the next governmental elections.

Selection of MPAP focus area and exploring interest

A first (preparatory) visit is organized to the selected city in order to meet with key stakeholders in urban and peri-urban agriculture, to present RUAF and the MPAP, further explore their interest in and potential contributions to the MPAP, prepare for further awareness raising activities (see below), decide which Municipality within a larger city (metropole) or which Division/ Administrative Zone within a municipality will be selected as focus area for the MPAP and discuss which organizations and staff could be included in the programme management committee and local MPAP facilitating or core team (Terms of Reference, required qualities, gender balance in composition, possible candidates), responsible for respectively supervising and implementing the MPAP process.

Selection of MPAP focus area

Especially when working in a larger city or metropole, which often consists of various municipalities, or when working in a larger municipality consisting of different municipal departments or administrative zones, it has proven important to select one (preferably independent, with its own decision-making structure) focus area for the MPAP. It will be very difficult to implement a MPAP at the levels of cities as large as several million inhabitants (like Hyderabad, India or Bogota, Colombia). It will be far easier to work at a lower and smaller level of administration, possibly in a later stage trying to upscale findings and results to a higher level.

Important criteria for selecting such focus areas are:

- Political interest and commitment of the responsible authority” to the MPAP
- Presence, interest and commitment of local NGOs and/or Universities working in the focus area to form part of the local MPAP team
- The types of urban and peri-urban agriculture farming systems found in this area are –as much as possible– representative for the entire municipality or city
- Availability of vacant land suitable for urban agriculture development
- Poor urban (farming) households form a major category of urban households in the area
- The issues at stake in this area are key issues for development of urban agriculture in the entire municipality or city
- The existence of good contacts with local urban farmers, neighbourhood groups, marketing organisations, etcetera in the area
- The selected Municipality/Department is representative for other parts of the city and experiences gained in this area can serve as good starting points for up-scaling to other parts of the municipality/city later on.

Establishment of a programme management committee and local MPAP facilitating team, development of an overall work plan and procedures

During their first or a second visit, the RUAF partner will support the establishment of a programme management or steering committee as well as a local MPAP core or facilitating team that will promote and guide the local MPAP. The first committee will be made of directors/coordinators of the institutional partners and governmental administration involved and act as an overall supervising body. The local MPAP facilitating team (which is called the “MPAP enabling team” in Hyderabad and Bangalore, India, and the “Technical Support Committee” in Pikine-Dakar, Senegal) will be responsible for coordinating, planning, organising and implementing the MPAP process (including implementation of the situation analysis, facilitating the dialogue between a larger number of (local) stakeholders that will come together in a multi-stakeholder platform to decide how best to address and solve identified key issues, and supporting action planning, policy design, monitoring and evaluation). It is helpful if such MPAP facilitating teams integrate competent staff of the most relevant municipal departments, representatives of urban producer groups, NGOs or university staff. For example, the Technical Support Committee in Pikine is made up of 12 members, including a representative from a farmers’ organisation, technical experts from various organisations, and several municipal councillors.

The RUAF partner, the project management committee and local MPAP facilitating team proceed to clarify and agree on the objectives of the MPAP, the process to be followed and the working and communication procedures to be applied and develop an overall work plan for the various awareness, training and planning activities. A more detailed work plan for the situation analysis will be developed after a first MPAP training/planning meeting has been organised.

Agreements should be made on meeting schedules to regularly discuss activities implemented, progress, problems encountered, lessons learned and recommendations. In this regard, it is also important to agree on forms, tools and responsibilities for built-in monitoring and process documentation. Agreements should also be made on forms and frequency of communication, applying a variety of tools such as email contact, telephone contacts and personal visits. In some cities, detailed minutes are being made of each programme committee and local MPAP team meeting and shared among all team members and with the regional RUAF coordinator. Such minutes can also easily be shared by individual team members with their organisations. In other

cities, individual team members and the MPAP team as a whole also keep a regular log-book, diary and photo-archive.

The committee and MPAP team should also ensure that the required financial and human resources are made available for implementation of the MPAP, for team meeting and monitoring activities. Institutional commitments and contributions to the process should be clarified and –whenever possible – formalised (see further below).

Awareness raising

Beyond the need for awareness raising on the costs, benefits and approaches inherent to any MPAP process, an important prerequisite for a MPAP related to urban agriculture is recognition of the value, benefits, potentials and support needs of urban agriculture by political leaders, heads of administrative bodies and other partner organisations. Therefore it is necessary to raise their awareness on the issue, and to provide them with adequate information on the role of urban agriculture in sustainable city development by providing them with research data on the actual and potential positive and negative impacts of urban agriculture (fact sheets) and its contributions to existing policy goals (policy briefs), as well as examples of urban agriculture policies and programmes implemented by other cities. Organisation of a one or half day **policy awareness seminar** to brief local councillors, heads of departments and other key stakeholders has turned out to be a very effective instrument. Additionally, taking such persons to the field to meet with urban farmers, organising city to city exchanges or study visits on urban agriculture or publicising urban agriculture in the local media (article in newspaper, video on TV, radio programme) also form effective strategies.

Training

The local MPAP team members as well as representatives of the different key stakeholders, who will take part in implementing the MPAP process, will most probably need to be trained in implementation of the MPAP-process in their city. In RUAF’s experience, the training should include technical, methodological, institutional, policy and legal aspects of urban and peri-urban agriculture as well as training on the process and techniques of MPAP.

Training can be most effectively combined with planning sessions for each of the different phases of the MPAP process. The MPAP training/planning workshops have shown to be most effective when split up in various blocks, the first one dealing with “General introduction to urban agriculture concepts, benefits/risks and the MPAP process”,

“Preparation, planning and methods and tools on data-gathering and gender-sensitive analysis for the second phase of the MPAP, being situation analysis” (see below), as well as with “Tools and methods for process documentation and built-in monitoring. Following training/planning workshops dealing with other phases of the MPAP, such as the setting up a multi-stakeholder forum, development and operationalisation of a City Strategic Agenda on urban agriculture, project planning, revision of norms, bye-laws and regulations and impact monitoring can be organized later in the process.

In the case of RUAF, the MPAP training/planning workshops were prepared in regional **Training of Trainers (ToT) workshops** as to train selected regional and local trainers in the various subjects and adapt the various modules/sessions of the training- as developed by the RUAF coordination- to regional/local conditions. The ToT also served to harmonise understanding of the various definitions, concepts and frameworks used, as well as to strengthen capacities of resource persons on adult-learning methods. Staff trained in the ToT were responsible for organising the MPAP training/planning workshops and played a role in further integrating MPAP and urban agriculture training in regional curricula (For more information on RUAFs training activities and approaches, see the Working Paper on Training for MPAP).

Planning of Situation Analysis

After the training, one or more follow-up planning sessions with the local MPAP facilitating team should be organized to:

- ❖ Prepare each component of the situation analysis in detail, identify what type of information is already available or should be will be collected, how and for what area of study;
- ❖ Make decisions on which partner will implement what part of the situation analysis;
- ❖ Define a time schedule for meetings to discuss progress and interim and final results, and
- ❖ Define what resources will be needed for implementing the analysis and how to cover these.

The output of these meetings will thus be a **detailed work plan for the situation analysis**. Draft work plans developed might have to be validated and consolidated by the programme management committee and/or institutional directors. In some cases, local MPAP teams also decided to sign specific cooperation agreements for implementation of the situation analysis (see below).



Including urban agriculture in municipal plans in Lima (photo: IPES).

Formalising commitments

Heads of the organisations participating in the programme management committee as well as the main decision-makers should preferably make a formal statement that lays out their policy intentions regarding urban and peri-urban agriculture and their support – through applying a MPAP– for the formulation of (new or improved) urban agriculture policies and action programmes on urban agriculture. For such a formal statement, see below a copy of the statement formulated by the programme committee in Serilingampally- Hyderabad, India.

Declaration for the promotion of urban and peri-urban agriculture in Serilingampally, Hyderabad

Our vision is to contribute to the reduction of urban poverty and food insecurity through sustainable urban and peri-urban agriculture (UPA) and to stimulate participatory and gender-inclusive governance for the municipality of Serilingampally, Hyderabad.

We **acknowledge** that:

- UPA is a widely practised activity in and around towns and cities within the region on parcels of land with alternative competing uses;
- UPA has generally been practised informally without appropriate policy, legislative and institutional frameworks;
- UPA will continue to play a significant role in addressing food security, employment creation and income generation, health and nutrition and improving the economies of urban areas;
some governments in the region have made significant progress in incorporating UPA in their urban development plans, and others are now beginning to rise to the challenge;

Recognizing,

- the existence and increasing practice of UPA and also noting the many challenges that it faces, including:
- the absence of, inadequacy of and / or inconsistency between the policies, legislation and institutional arrangements for regulating UPA
- the limited availability of and access to resources
- the lack of sufficient research, documentation and information-sharing, both nationally and regionally
- the need for environmental sustainability

Accepting,

that the foregoing challenges require immediate and prudent reform of policies, legislative and institutional arrangements in order to effectively integrate UPA into planning activities in the municipality of Serilingampally, Hyderabad.

We therefore,

call for the promotion of a shared vision of UPA that takes into account the specific needs and conditions in the instruments that will create a gender-sensitive enabling environment for integrating UPA into our urban planning processes.

Signed by:

Mr. S.A. Kadhar Saheb, Municipal Reform Officer (SWM) Hyderabad; Mrs. Gayatri Ramachandran, DG EPTRI;

Ms. Anna Matthew, Principal Ruda Mistry College; J. Venkatesh, HOD, Centre for Spatial Information and Technology JNTU

Source: International Water Management Institute, South Asia Regional Office, Hyderabad, India 2006

PHASE 2: SITUATION ANALYSIS

Aim

The first task in the MPAP process, and the basis for any strategic planning process, is to define the present state of urban and peri-urban agriculture in the city. This will be done by implementing a situation analysis. Where is urban agriculture currently taking place or where could it take place, what are the main urban agriculture systems found and what are their support needs, who are the main stakeholders that could or should be involved in urban agriculture development and what are their needs and opinions, what are the main problems and risks, benefits and potentials for urban agriculture development?

In summary, a situation analysis is thus undertaken with the following objectives:

- a. To collect **existing and some additional qualitative and quantitative information** regarding urban and peri-urban agriculture in the city (what, where, who);
- b. Which will serve as a basis for:
 - the **identification of the main key issues to be addressed: needs, problems, potentials and opportunities** for safe and sustainable Urban Agriculture development in the city
 - the **identification of possible strategies and interventions** (information campaigns, training, research, projects, policies etcetera) to respond to those problems and opportunities and to enhance the role of Urban Agriculture in urban poverty alleviation, urban food security, local economic development, and creation of a better living environment.
- c. Especially if the situation analysis is implemented in collaboration with a group of local stakeholders it will also function as a means to **build up the mutual understanding, dialogue and collaboration between different stakeholders in urban and peri-urban agriculture** (various types of urban farmers, food vendors, community organisations, NGO's, municipal authorities including urban planners, health authorities, water and waste management authorities, etc.) and to enhance their commitment to participate in concerted planning and actions regarding Urban Agriculture.

Often, an initial situation analysis will be followed in later stages of the planning process by more focused in depth studies of specific problems and potential solutions

Information to be collected and analysed

Given the above, main areas of information to be collected during the situation analysis, with views on later policy development and planning, include:

- ❖ **Some basic data on the city**, especially (trends in) urban growth (number of inhabitants and spatial growth of the city), poverty rates, unemployment rates and malnutrition rates - preferably for the different parts of the city (as this is important for later selection of the MPAP focus area), as well as on the **agro-ecological environment** (climate, soil, rainfall).

This data will be collected through a review of existing information, literature and research reports, and review of available statistics (**collection and review of existing information through desk studies and Internet searches**). The information collected will provide a good starting point for:

- ❖ Information regarding the **political, legal and institutional context** in which urban and peri-urban agriculture takes place: the legal and planning framework related to (peri)urban agriculture, stakeholders involved and their relationships:
 - What are current decision-making structures? (What type of policies and policy instruments does (or can) the local government or a specific government department develop? Can they elaborate and approve new by-laws, norms and regulations, can they implement fiscal or tax incentives? How are such policy instruments currently developed or reviewed? What forms and level of public participation in these processes?)
 - What are actual policies, regulations and urban development and zoning plans that effect urban and peri-urban agriculture? What are possibilities to enhance and improve the effectiveness of existing policies and plans and/or their relevance for certain categories of the population (e.g. women, the poor)?
 - What are outdated or unnecessary restrictive norms and regulations regarding (peri)urban agriculture (in municipal by-laws, ordinances, zoning regulations etc) that should be removed or adapted?
 - Are there any inconsistencies regarding (peri)urban agriculture and other sector policies (e.g. economic and social development policies, public health or environmental management policies) and between policies at different levels (local versus national –in their treatment of urban agriculture that need to be harmonized, or what are opportunities to integrate urban agriculture better into these sector policies?

- What projects (research-, action-) have been implemented, are being implemented or are planned regarding urban and peri-urban agriculture and related issues (e.g. recycling or urban wastes and wastewater in agriculture)?
- Which institutions/organisations do play and can/should play a role in development of urban and peri-urban agriculture? What are their mandates? Where do they work and with whom?
- What are their views on urban and peri-urban agriculture?
- What type of services they provide (or could provide) to urban farmers?

Answers to the above mentioned questions can be provided by implementing (1) A critical review of the existing policies norms and regulations (**policy review through desk studies and interviews**) as well as (2) Identification and “profiling” of the main institutional stakeholders in urban and peri-urban agriculture including interviews with representatives of the various stakeholder to get their views on present and future of urban and peri-urban agriculture (**stakeholder analysis through literature and web searches, questionnaires and interviews**).

The critical policy review includes a review of policy documents, bylaws, ordinances, regulations, etcetera, that deal directly with urban and peri-urban agriculture (or a specific type of (peri)urban, e.g. horticulture, aquaculture, community gardening, etcetera), as well as other policies, plans and regulations that have a strong influence on urban agriculture (e.g. city and land use plans and zonification norms, health regulations, etcetera). Critical policy review should consider both national and municipal policies and regulations, depending on the countries political system and level of decentralisation. See the *Working Paper on Situation Analysis* for more details on the implementation of such a policy review.

Regarding stakeholder analysis, it is important to get to know in an early stage whom the main stakeholders in (peri)urban agriculture are, what their interests are, their perceptions of urban and peri-urban agriculture as well as their potential contributions to the development of the MPAP and of urban and peri-urban agriculture. Please see box for a list of institutional stakeholders identified in Freetown, Sierra Leone.

Stakeholder analysis will help to motivate organisations to work together in the start up and implementation

Institutional stakeholders involved in urban agriculture in Freetown, Sierra Leone

- Ministry of Agriculture Forestry and Food Security (MAFFS)
- Njala University
- Freetown City Council
- National farmers Association of Sierra Leone (NAFSL)
- Livestock Extension and General Services (LEXES) – NGO
- Planning Evaluation Monitoring and Statistics Department (of national level MAFFS)
- Western Area Rural Council
- Land and Water Development Department
- Land and Country planning Department
- National Commission on Environment and Forestry
- Women in Agriculture and Nutrition

of urban agriculture projects and programmes, and to analyse the relations between the various stakeholders, including cooperation and conflicts, as to provide a basis for identification of effective strategies to improve networking, communications, coordination and cooperation between the various stakeholders. In the stakeholder analysis we thus focus on **institutions, organisations and networks** only. Understanding the perceptions and needs of direct stakeholders and urban farmers will be undertaken in the context of the participatory appraisal of selected urban and peri-urban farming systems (see below). The *Working Paper on Situation Analysis* provides further details on this component.

- ❖ Information regarding the **presence and location of various types of urban and peri-urban agriculture** in/around the city and their main characteristics and related up- and downstream activities (composting, processing, marketing)
 - What types of (peri)urban agriculture are practised?
 - Where are these various urban agriculture types practised? What are available open spaces where urban agriculture could be practised? Under what tenure systems?
 - What are the characteristics of the current and potential urban agriculture areas (for example related to their availability, accessibility and suitability) found?
 - What are past, current and future changes in land related to (proposed) city expansion?

Such information can be collected by analysis of city maps and available GIS materials and visiting various parts of the city and its surroundings (field studies) (**land use mapping using topographical and GIS maps and ground thruthing**). This information will provides a basis for identifying in what areas urban agriculture might be undertaken in a sustainable way, how urban agriculture could be in municipal physical and land use planning and what strategies to develop to increase access of the urban poor to available and suitable spaces for food production.

Mapping urban agriculture “land use” in Gampaha, Sri Lanka and Bogota, Colombia

Urban agriculture in Gampaha, Sri Lanka takes place in and around the house (in backyards and patios), on institutional land (for example school-gardens), on open areas of land in the city and on larger areas of land surrounding the city – including former rice-fields. Apart from urban agriculture taking place on private and public open land areas in Bogota, Colombia, urban agriculture is also very much present on Bogota’s rooftops. Available rooftop areas in Bogota were mapped and studied and –as part of the MPAP– a pilot project was formulated to design and promote rooftop gardens in the city.

The *Working Paper on Situation Analysis* will provide more details on the implementation of this component of the situation analysis.

- ❖ Information regarding the social, economic, health/ nutrition and ecological benefits of various types of urban and peri-urban agriculture in this city as well as its negative impacts on health and the ecology:
 - What crops are grown, animals raised, inputs used (including recycling of organic wastes and waste water); level of technologies applied and capital invested in different urban agriculture systems, what is the output produced and its use (auto-consumption, barter, market)?
 - Who are involved, number of farming households and persons (male/female), their characteristics and socio-economic profile (level of income, origin, other jobs, and their objectives for urban farming; land ownership and tenure regulations; gender aspects; local leadership and factions); social networks of farming groups and coping mechanisms (access

to inputs, credit, extension services and business support services)?

- What is the contribution of urban and peri-urban agriculture to enhance the income of urban farmers?
- What are impacts of urban and peri-urban agriculture on nutrition and food security especially of low income groups and HIV-Aids affected families?
- What are impacts of urban and peri-urban agriculture on recycling of urban organic wastes and waste water, and improvement of the urban climate (greening, capturing dust, shade)?
- What are impacts on community development and social inclusion ((peri)urban projects as a catalyser in run down communities, creating access to productive inputs and new development chances to disadvantaged groups (single women with children, youth without jobs, people with a handicap, etcetera)?

What are health and environmental risks associated with urban agriculture (evidence of incidence of zoonosis, malaria, antrax, avian influenza, etcetera due to urban and peri-urban agriculture)?

This information will be obtained, next to analysing information on the other components, by applying Participatory Rapid Appraisal (PRA) exercises in selected urban farming areas to collect more information on characteristics, problems and potentials of the main urban farming systems and the viewpoints of the urban farmers on required policy measures (**PRA and field visits in selected areas**). Special attention will be given to the **gender** division of labour, gender differentiated access to productive resources, technical training, credit and the benefits derived from the agricultural activities. PRA also helps to identify main perceptions of the various types of urban farmers and related local stakeholders on urban and peri-urban agriculture: its benefits, the problems they encounter, their perspectives on the development of their farms/gardens in the near future and their needs to realise their plans. It will also support identification of the main potentials for the development of each farming type into safe and sustainable farming and the present constraints and opportunities for the realization of these potentials. See *Working Paper on Situation Analysis* for more details on this component of the Situation Analysis.

All the information collected will finally help to analyse the **local factors that facilitate or constrain the development of safe and sustainable urban and peri-urban agriculture** in the city, e.g. regarding:

- ❖ The physical conditions in which urban and peri-urban agriculture is taking place (quality of soils and water used, distance to sources of contamination, distance to markets)
- ❖ Access to land, technical information, credit, markets, etcetera
- ❖ Actual policy and institutional environment (degree of legality of urban and peri-urban agriculture, existing restrictions and incentives, institutional support provided, etcetera)
- ❖ Degree of farmer organization, their capacities and their access to development planning and decision making
- ❖ Existence or absence of programmes that promote urban poverty alleviation, nutrition, social inclusion, recycling of urban (organic) wastes and waste water, and their interest in urban and peri-urban agriculture as a complementary strategy
- ❖ Cultural and religious habits influencing food production and consumption, etcetera.

Integration of results and reporting

On each of the components a sub-report will be produced by the local partner that assumed the coordination of this component. The results of all components will be analysed by the entire local MPAP facilitating team, especially with regards to:

- ❖ The characterisation of different urban agriculture types;
- ❖ The identification of main risks and negative impacts associated with (the various types of) urban and peri-urban agriculture in the actual situation and possible strategies to prevent or reduce these;
- ❖ The identification of main problems encountered by urban farmers in the actual situation and possible strategies to overcome existing problems;
- ❖ The identification of main potentials for the development of safe and sustainable urban and peri-urban agriculture and possible strategies to promote the realization of these potentials,
- ❖ The identification of current and potential relevance of urban and peri-urban agriculture for the various policy domains (health/nutrition, local economic development and poverty alleviation, urban environmental management, etcetera);
- ❖ The identification of main actors that are presently or should be involved in further development of urban and peri-urban agriculture and the role that each of them

plays or could and should play

- ❖ The identification of a first set of possible actions and interventions that form the basis of the further development of a City Strategic Agenda on urban agriculture.

Findings and results of all components will then be used to prepare a concise “**policy narrative**” that provides a good basis for sharing of the results of the situation analysis with all stakeholders and as a basis for reflection, discussion, joint visioning and strategic planning in the Multi Stakeholder Forum and working groups (See further Phase 3 below).

Such a policy narrative could include:

1. Presentation of the **key data regarding urban agriculture** in the city (presence, types and locations),
2. Statements **justifying the importance given to the issue and the need to intervene** : policy areas related to UA, impacts on living conditions, future implications,
3. Important **constraints** encountered by (each type of) urban farmers and other actors,
4. Identified **potential** of (each type of) urban agriculture for existing municipal policy goals,
5. The **expected negative consequences of non-intervention** / continuation of the present policies; analysis of the actual interventions (what worked well/failed, what lessons were learned), and
6. A draft outline of a **city’s strategic agenda on urban agriculture** (containing a city vision on urban agriculture, key areas for interventions, identification of main strategies and instruments that might be applied, identification of available human and financial resources as well as potential sources) (see further Phase 3 below).

Lessons learned regarding implementation of the situation analysis

Develop the situation analysis in sub-teams instead of contracting it out to one organisation

A certain amount of funding is made available by the RUAF programme to implement the situation analysis. As it will be less likely that one partner organisation has the required capacity and means to implement the entire situation analysis, conformation of sub teams of the local MPAP team (each one with their own coordinator and each implementing one component of the situation analysis) has

Situation analysis in Accra (Ghana)

A situation analysis on urban agriculture in the Accra metropolis was conducted from June-September 2005. The situation analysis revealed the phenomenon of urban agriculture in the Accra metropolis and highlighted constraints for its development, especially in relation to urban growth and increasing land use values. It has provided a basis for planning and identifying the policy directions that need to be pursued. There are currently no specific policies for urban agriculture, however, the bye-laws and regulations of the Accra Metropolitan Area are restrictive and set limitations to livestock production (obviously due to health and environmental concerns). Strategies for implementing an urban agriculture programme in Accra will have to be approached from a perspective of awareness creation, lobbying, negotiation and capacity building, as well as reviewing existing (livestock) by-laws, regulations and developing new policies that promotes the adoption of space confined livestock and non-traditional production systems (grasscutters, rabbits, mushroom and snails) and their integration in land use planning.

Source: Larbi, T., O. Cofie and T. Schutz, 2005. RUAF Progress Report July- September, 2005. International Water Management Institute, Regional office for Africa, Accra-Ghana.

proven to be more successful. This will also help creating further interest in and commitment to the process. One local coordinator (or coordinating organization) will then be selected to coordinate and supervise the overall implementation of the situation analysis.

Make optimum use of limited financial means available

Generally, only limited (financial) means are available to conduct the situation analysis. Hence it is very important:

- To make maximum use of the existing available information.
- To motivate local stakeholders to implement their part of the situation analysis as much as possible with their own resources, reserving available project funds as much as possible for those costs that can not easily be covered by them (complimentary funding, rather than paying full costs).
- To do things at the right scale and the right level of detail. It will probably not be possible to do a detailed analysis of farming systems and available vacant land for an entire city or municipality (depending on its size). That is why it is proposed to first do a global identification of the types of urban agriculture and where they are located, and then advance with a more detailed analysis in some selected zones.
- Do not try to collect all details, but aim for good understanding and getting the main issues, magnitudes, trends, and main factors right.
- Triangulate data: seek verification of certain data by combining different sources of information (literature reviews, interviews with key stakeholders,

use of maps, participatory farming system analysis, etcetera).

Do not strive for a one-dimensional picture

Different viewpoints may exist on the same reality. It is therefore very important always to make note of by whom the information was provided (person/organisation), with what objectives and in what perspective, especially when it comes to the interpretation of certain "facts" and the conclusions and recommendations that are derived from the information. E.g. a health department will look with other eyes to the reuse of urban wastes and wastewater in agriculture than the environmental officer or the officer in charge with poverty alleviation, let alone the poor urban farmers involved in these practices. It is important not to highlight only one opinion or viewpoint but to identify and show such different views on the existing reality, identified problems or potentials and desired developments.

PHASE 3: BROADENING INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT AND SETTING THE AGENDA

Once the situation analysis is finalised and summarised in the policy narrative, it will be shared with all identified stakeholders in order:

- a. To **inform them on the present situation** (presence, types, problems and potentials) of urban and peri-urban agriculture in the city,
- b. To **enhance their involvement** in the MPAP process and **broaden their commitment** to actively contribute to the policy formulation and action planning process through their participation in a multi-stakeholder forum on urban agriculture,
- c. To provide a basis for the **discussion and selection of the key issues** that need to be attended in a City Strategic Agenda on Urban Agriculture and the **identification of possible strategies** or courses of action regarding each issue.

Second MPAP Training

At this point in time in the RUAF partner cities, a second MPAP Training/planning workshop is organized covering issues like the “Setting up and functioning of a Multi - Stakeholder Forum”; “Key issues and courses of action for urban agriculture development” and “Development of a City Strategic Agenda on urban and peri-urban agriculture”. Similar to planning of the situation analysis, this second training/planning workshop will be followed by a more detailed planning of the next phases of the MPAP: the establishment of Multi-Stakeholder Forum and development of the Strategic Agenda with the local MPAP facilitating team.

Strengthening/broadening institutional commitment and participation

Before inviting the stakeholders identified during the situation analysis to participate in further planning and development of a city-wide urban agriculture programme, their interest in and commitment to such a process might need to be further developed. RUAF partners have applied the following strategies in doing so:

- a. Organising **individual visits to important stakeholders** in order to discuss in-depth the most important problems/issues identified in the situation analysis and policy narrative and to explore alternative solutions and intervention strategies, discuss their possible roles and identify available human and financial resources to concretely support development of an urban agricultural programme, discuss the desired organisational set up of

the intended (peri)urban agriculture programme, and to check/strengthen their initial commitments.

- b. Organization of **study/exchange visits** to more advanced cities. Such study visits can be very instrumental in raising the motivation/commitment of the visiting (and receiving) organisations to participate in the planning and or implementation of policies and programmes on (peri)urban agriculture, enhance their understanding of the MPAP approach and process, and to broaden their knowledge on (certain types of) urban agriculture, the development perspectives and options of each of these types and their potential contributions to local development objectives (e.g. policy alleviation, social inclusion, gender equity, local economic development, waste recycling, etcetera). The basic idea behind them is again that one policy maker (or Dean of a University or farmer) can more easily convince another policy maker (Dean or farmer) than any other stakeholder ever can.
- c. **Taking high officials to field sites** as to illustrate for example how urban agriculture and the services provided by it, are or will be affected by present or future policies. Such a visit, which has to be arranged with time, can be the most effective way of communicating a need. It may show a policy maker that certain things are actually happening or needed (of which he or she may not have been aware), it will provide the people ultimately affected (and forming important part of the policy makers’ constituency) the opportunity to voice their concerns and demands and will provide the policy maker further insight in what he or she may actually do to support these people. One could additionally provide good publicity on the site visit as to ‘boost’ public opinion on the policy makers’ involvement. However, the visit should be well orchestrated with the people in the field, to clarify expectations and avoid strong potential conflicting arguments with the policy makers.
- d. **Involvement of press/media:** publicising the issue through opinion-makers and –leaders such as the media (press, radio and television), or influential individuals. The publication of a regular Magazine in Chinese on urban agriculture by the Chinese RUAF partner IGSNRR, the subsequent publication of two books on urban agriculture and agri-tourism, and TV broadcasting of a video on this subject have helped to develop a rapidly growing urban agriculture network of researchers and city officials. The network was formalised in 2006 into the first Chinese National Association on Urban Agriculture.

Study visit Department of Agriculture (Sri Lanka) to RUAF partner organizations in Hyderabad and Bangalore (India)

This 4-day regional exchange/study visit cum training, organized by RUAF's partner IWMI India, between representatives of the Western Province, Department of Agriculture, Sri Lanka and representatives from partner organizations in Hyderabad and Bangalore was initiated to:

- Address the lack of awareness and change perceptions of partner organizations in Hyderabad and Bangalore on the feasibility of urban agriculture in a highly urbanised context a.o through the use of Low/No Space Technologies
- Provide a platform for the dissemination of the Family Business Garden Concept from Colombo Sri Lanka to cities in India.
- Provide a platform for the regional exchange of ideas on local adaptations for low space no space technologies
- Create stronger linkages with city partners through a joint learning activity and exchange of ideas
- Establish a policy level dialogue in Hyderabad through Ministerial level discussions
- Use media coverage associated with Ministerial meetings to promote urban and peri-urban agriculture and the RUAF-CFF Project

The study visit resulted in:

- 18 Master Trainers from 11 organizations were trained in low space no space technologies
- Participants were further sensitized to the RUAF-CFF Project
- New low space no space innovations were developed and will be taken back and adopted in Western Province, Sri Lanka
- Multiple stakeholders got sensitized and expressed strong interest in follow-up training in the future
- Stronger linkages were established with the Hyderabad Municipal Council and Hyderabad Urban Development Authority particularly with regards their programs to alleviate urban poverty and their existing women self-help groups
- IWMI India/RUAF was invited to exhibit its No Space/Low Space technologies and associated knowledge materials in the upcoming Annual Andhra Pradesh Horticultural Show during January 24-27th 2007 show at which 300,000 people attended
- The study visit/training helped to initiate a working relationship with the Horticulture Department and Horticultural Training Institute in Hyderabad and strengthen working relations with the NGO "Merits" from Serilingampally Municipality (Hyderabad) to promote, in collaboration with IWMI and the Municipal Authorities, urban agriculture in low income households with a particular focus on low space no space technologies
- Training on No Space/Low Space was included in the training curriculum of the Andhra Pradesh Horticulture Institute.

Source: R. Simmons, 2006. RUAF Annual Report, 2006. International Water Management Institute, Regional office for South and South-East Asia, Hyderabad, India.

Establishment of a Multi-Stakeholder Forum on Urban Agriculture

Identified and more motivated stakeholders are now invited to be part of a Multi-Stakeholder Forum (MSF) on urban agriculture as to:

- a. **bridge the communication gap** between the various stakeholders involved in urban and peri-urban agriculture and function as a more permanent platform for information exchange and dialogue,

- b. **build effective and sustainable partnerships** for coordination, planning, implementation and monitoring of a concerted city strategic agenda on urban agriculture,
- c. **stimulate the institutionalisation of such activities.**

The MSF should include all key stakeholder groups required to design and to implement, in a participatory manner, adequate solutions to the problems or potentials identified in



Field visits Dakar (photo Moussa Sy).

the situation analysis and policy narrative. As the objectives of the MSF are to develop a City Strategic Agenda on urban agriculture and operationalise the Agenda into urban agriculture projects, revised or new urban agriculture by-laws, plans, norms and regulations and to institutionalise urban and peri-urban agriculture, the inclusion of the ultimate beneficiaries (urban farmers and their organisations), technical staff (NGOs, CBOs, research institutes and governmental organisations, donor organisations) as well as directors/decision makers in the MSF is crucial.

The MSF should be coordinated by one organisation (or a secretariat) with proven capacities in team-management, conflict resolution and negotiation skills, and action planning methodologies. This organisation will be supported by a coordinating unit/steering committee made up of members of the local MPAP core team and eventually some other key stakeholders. The Forum should be independent from the political structure though preferably be formally recognised and supported by the Municipality (and other stakeholders) as a platform for the promotion of urban and peri-urban agriculture in their city. The role and mandate of the Forum should thus be clarified. The importance of local ownership and member

contributions to the functioning of the multi-stakeholder forum and implementation of activities should be stressed. A central justification for building such multi-stakeholder partnerships has –after all- to do with making the best use of available local financial and human resources. In addition, external resources may be mobilised by involving donor agencies in the MSF. (For more detail on the roles and functioning of a MSF, please see the *Working Paper on Establishment of the multi-stakeholder forum and development of the city strategic agenda on urban agriculture.*)

Development of a City Strategic Agenda on Urban Agriculture

After the policy narrative (Situation Analysis) has been presented to and discussed in the Multi-stakeholder Forum, one of the first activities of the Forum would be to agree on the City's strategic agenda on urban agriculture.

Content of the Agenda

The agenda should include:

1. The **formal decision** to design and adopt a municipal policy and programme on urban agriculture;
2. The city's vision regarding the desired development of urban agriculture: why do we

want to support urban agriculture (for example for reasons of poverty alleviation, improving urban food security and nutrition, promoting local economic development, improving waste management or a combination thereof). This entails the functions one expects urban agriculture to play in the realisation of the city's strategic development plan and municipal policy objectives or the kind of developments in urban agriculture that will be supported or conditioned. This section will also link the urban agriculture agenda to other existing agendas and programmes in the city that are related with one or more of the mentioned policy goals;

3. The **key issues**: what are the main issues we will work on (for example capacity building in urban agriculture, local production and marketing of urban agriculture, access to land or financial resources, sustainable use of wastewater in urban agriculture, strengthening the legal and institutional framework for urban agriculture etcetera);
4. **Identification of the main strategies or courses of action to be applied for each of the key issues and**

an assessment of their likely impacts, target groups (whose behaviour and decisions are to be influenced) and **beneficiaries** (who are intended to benefit from this strategy). In most cases the strategies proposed are not alternatives, but overlap and complement each other;

5. **Development of an institutional framework** (what actors should be involved?) and proposed coordination mechanisms;
6. **Identification of available resources for implementation as well as potential sources of additional funding**;
7. An initial **time-plan** for its operationalisation and implementation.

Elements 1-3 (formal decision, vision and key issues) of the City Strategic Agenda are sometimes referred to as a **conceptual or contextual framework**, whereas elements 4, 5, 6 and 7 (strategies, institutional framework, sources of financing and initial time-plan) form the Agenda itself, which might be presented in the same or a separate document.

Factors for success: a Multi-Stakeholder Forum in Lima (Peru)

In Villa María del Triunfo, Lima, a city forum on urban agriculture was formed in May 2006. The city forum is made up of 20 organisations and institutions (including universities, NGOs, CBOs and urban producer groups, national governmental institutions, international organisations, such as FAO, and private enterprises). A facilitating and local team acts as secretariat of the forum. The forum meets regularly to develop the city's strategic agenda on urban agriculture, to be finalised by October 2006. IPES, a Peruvian NGO and RUAF partner, supports the forum and identified the following factors related to its success:

- The stakeholders that make up the forum are very motivated to further develop urban agriculture, as a result of previous awareness raising and sensitisation activities developed by the local MPAP facilitating team during the situation analysis stage. For example, a NGO working on urban design and planning is interested in integrating urban agriculture into the (re)design of neighbourhoods.
- As a result, the stakeholders incorporated elaboration of the strategic agenda into their institutional activities.
- The day and hour of the meetings are set by the forum members and meetings are well-planned and moderated. The programme always includes use of energisers and presentation of audiovisual material on urban agriculture experiences in other cities of Latin America.
- The forum also plans other activities such as exchange visits.
- The facilitating team sends friendly, motivating and warm reminder emails to the Forum members or calls them personally to motivate them to attend all meetings. It is very important to create a friendly and trusting relationship with each member.
- The discussions and agreements made at the meetings are documented and sent to all the members after each meeting.

Personal communication: Gunther Merzthal, IPES-Promotion for Sustainable Development, September 2006.

The city strategic agenda thus in fact constitutes a policy document once formally adopted by the local government and other stakeholders, aiming to induce certain changes in the decisions and behaviour of actors in that society in order to achieve certain goals. Subsequently, such a well-defined strategic agenda in its operation should include and lead to effective **operational planning and implementation of projects and the policy measures identified**, as well as **periodic review and adaptation of the Agenda** based on the experiences gained during its implementation (only in practice does one find out what strategies and instruments work well and what others are less effective).

Developing the Agenda

Based on a presentation and discussion of the policy narrative, the elements 1-3 of the Agenda should be discussed and agreed upon by the entire Multi-stakeholder Forum during its **first (and following) MSF meeting(s)**. Please see the box on the next page for a vision statement developed in Cape Town, South Africa.

On this basis, the Forum can further define the other components of the strategic agenda (key issues, strategies, institutional framework, funding arrangements and time-plan). RUAF partner cities have applied different methodologies for further development of the city strategic agenda. Even though in all cases different working groups were formed -each with a specific assignment and formed by those stakeholders that are most involved or experienced in the issues to be discussed or and that can play a role in implementing the specific issues they work upon- the Agenda was further elaborated in intensive 3-4 day workshops for example (as done in Bobo Dialasso, Burkina Faso and Porto Novo, Benin) or in several meetings held over a period of 1-3 months (as done in Pikine –see box on page 27, Senegal and Belo Horizonte, Brazil).

It might however be that the present stakeholders involved in the MSF do not have all the required expertise or mandate or social basis to come to adequate strategy design and implementation, and additional actors are required to take part in the working groups, with views on their mandate, expertise and skills, resources (direct or indirect), influence and power. In each of these situations however, the working groups steadily refined and strengthened the earlier basic agreements and commitments. By building up participants' co-operation capacities and showing in practice the advantages of cross-sectoral co-operation and shared commitment to agreed common aims, the working groups also provided the basis for better co-ordination

Cape Town vision statement on and strategic goals for urban agriculture

“The City seeks to employ all available means to build a prosperous City in which no-one is left out. The City recognizes that urban agriculture can play a key role in strategies for poverty alleviation (food security and nutrition) and economic development (income generation). However the City is also aware of the numerous negative impacts of urban agriculture on city life. Therefore, the City supports and promotes urban agriculture within the context that it will not degrade the quality of life of citizens, will not impact harmfully on public health, the natural environment and will contribute to the economic and social well-being of people. In order to achieve this it is necessary to create an enabling and regulated environment in which the development and practice of urban agriculture can flourish. To promote “A prosperous and growing urban agricultural sector” in Cape Town, our vision is supported by the following strategic goals:

- To enable the poorest of the poor to utilize urban agriculture as an element of their survival strategy (household food security)
- To enable people to create commercially sustainable economic opportunities through urban agriculture (jobs and income)
- To enable previously disadvantaged people to participate in the land redistribution for agricultural development programme (redress imbalances)
- To facilitate human resources development (technical, business and social skills training)”.

Source: Draft Urban Agriculture Policy for the City of Cape Town, 2006.

of decisions and actions and facilitates mobilisation of resources. Results of the working groups were regularly shared with the entire Forum to validate a draft Strategic Agenda, agree on strategies for operationalisation and implementation of the Agenda, on monitoring and evaluation mechanisms as well as on (tentative) commitments regarding co-financing of planned projects and implementation of other policy measures.

For more detail on the development of the city strategic agenda and the functioning of the working groups, please see *Working Paper on Establishment of the multi-stakeholder forum and development of the city strategic agenda on urban agriculture.*

Policy instruments for urban agriculture

Contrary to what many people seem to believe, legislation is just one of the available policy instruments. Local governments have four main policy instruments available to them (each of which is based on a specific hypothesis regarding how behaviour of actors in society can be influenced). These are legal, economic, communicative / educative and urban design instruments.

Legal instruments

The logic underlying legal instruments is that the actors can be forced to adopt the desired behaviour through legal norms and regulations (municipal bye laws, ordinances, etc.) and that it is possible to control whether these actors adhere to these rules and norms. Actors who do not adhere to the rules will be sanctioned. This policy instrument is especially useful in cases when 1) the desired behaviour cannot be realised in another way; and 2) the rules can easily be controlled. In addition, the other instruments (economic, educational and design) also require an adequate legal basis. As such, the urban agriculture programme in Villa Maria del Triunfo-Lima, Peru, was formalised by law.

Economic instruments

The logic behind the application of economic instruments is the assumption that social actors will adopt the desired behaviour if this gives them some economic gains (or losses if they continue the undesired behaviour). Local governments may grant tax incentives or subsidies if actors adopt the desired behaviour or levy special taxes for undesired behaviour (like a levy on cigarettes or alcohol). Such economic instruments also need a legal basis, but the essential element here is not the law but the economic incentive/loss. This policy instrument is especially useful in cases when (a) the economic incentive is easily recognisable and substantial enough to have an effect and (b) the economic incentive is directly related to the desired/undesired behaviour.

Communicative / educative instruments

The assumption behind the use of these types of instruments is that people will adopt the desired behaviour if they are well informed about the positive effects of the desired behaviour and the negative effects of the undesired behaviour. Accordingly, information, education and persuasion tools (extension visits, training courses, leaflets, websites, etc.) will be applied to make people understand the importance of the desired change and to assist them in the change process. These instruments are often used complementary to the other policy instruments mentioned. The lack of an adequate communication and education strategy may strongly reduce the effectiveness of the other policy instruments used.

Urban design instruments

The logic behind urban design instruments is that actors will adopt the desired behaviour if their physical environment has been designed in such a way that the actors are more or less “automatically” prompted to; if public dustbins are widely available, people will throw less waste on the street. Examples related to urban agriculture are zoning, combining or separating certain land uses depending on the degree of conflict/synergy, inclusion of space for home or community gardening in social housing projects, etc. The municipality of Cape Town for example includes land for home or community gardening in slum upgrading projects.

Source: Wilbers J., and H. de Zeeuw, 2006. A critical review of recent policy documents on urban agriculture. In: “Urban Agriculture Magazine 16: Formulating effective policies on urban agriculture”. RUAF Foundation, Leusden, the Netherlands

Third MPAP Training

During the process of elaborating the City Strategic Agenda, a third MPAP training/planning workshop was organized by most RUAF partners to provide the MSF and working group participants concrete skills and tools for operationalisation of the City Strategic Agenda in terms of “Project planning,

design and monitoring”, “Policy formulation and monitoring and evaluation of policy changes”. Further training on team building, conflict management, management styles, advocacy (lobbying, negotiation and dialoguing) and networking may also be necessary.

Formal adoption of the City Strategic Agenda

Once the City Strategic Agenda has been developed, it should be officially presented to the Municipal Council (or one of its Sub-committees) and Mayor for its formal approval by the Municipality and inclusion of the planned activities in the annual municipal budget.

Lessons learned regarding establishment of the Multi-Stakeholder Forum and development of the City Strategic Agenda

Building up stakeholder engagement, motivation and local ownership of the Multi-Stakeholder Forum from the very start and throughout the process is crucial for effective functioning of the MSF

Where local ownership is higher, also the degree of implementation of the City Strategic Agenda on urban agriculture will be higher. Generally, people will *get involved* if they believe that the issue is important to them, their family or their organisation; if they have something to contribute; if they will be listened to and their contributions will be respected; and if they feel that their participation will make a difference. People will however *stay involved* if: (1) There are multiple opportunities for participation, from a small contribution of time and effort to progressively larger contributions of time and effort. The level of participation may vary over time, depending on circumstances and the way the MPAP develops; (2) They receive sufficient advance notice of participation opportunities, (3) Their participation is facilitated (for example child care, transportation, meals), (4) Their participation is listened to; their ideas are supported and respected, (5) Their participation has an impact/makes an appreciable difference and (6) Their participation is appreciated and that appreciation is acknowledged.

Elections and replacement of staff and “champions” for urban agriculture in the local partner organisations and local authorities may lead to changing policy conditions and changing views on the role of the organisation in and of development of urban agriculture in the city.

It is important to seek to reduce this risk by:

- ❖ Building of institutional rather than personal relations is thus important (although the latter or often the entrance to the former).
- ❖ Training of several officers in municipal departments and other partner organisations so that urban agriculture and the MPAP will be more widely supported and not depend on one or two persons.
- ❖ Strengthening the multi-stakeholder forum and securing its formal recognition and political support

Development of a City Strategic Agenda on Urban Agriculture in Pikine, Senegal


A multi-stakeholder forum in Pikine was hosted by the municipality of Pikine and involved municipal councillors, urban producers, the Technical Support Committee members, environmental, planning and agricultural authorities, NGOs and CBOs. Discussing the situation analysis, the forum participants identified the main key issues for (peri)urban agriculture development related to (1) access to water, other inputs and equipments; (2) access to land (3) norms and regulations. It was decided to further study and discuss these issues in three working groups that had to come up with strategies and operational plans on how to tackle the constraints regarding each issue and make optimum use of existing potentials in each area.

A forum session (April 2006) was also dedicated to the functioning of the working groups and agreements were made on the required profile of the working group members, their role and responsibilities, the activities to be implemented by the working groups and the profile and tasks of the working group coordinator.

After the forum meeting and following the setting up of the working groups, the RUAF partner IAGU (the African Institute for Urban Management) organised a strategic planning training session for the working group members. IAGU furthermore supported four (4) meetings held with each group, applying Local Agenda 21 tools for strategic planning. Each working group developed a set of strategies or courses of action related to the key issue they had analysed and a second forum meeting was organised in June 2006, to share the results of the working groups with all the stakeholders and to prioritise the strategies and actions to be implemented.

Source: Sy, Moussa and F. Gueye, 2006. RUAF Progress Report January-May, 2006. IAGU. Dakar, Senegal.

- (but maintaining an independent position viz-a-viz politicians), so that the forum can counter pressure for urban agriculture if negative changes in policies and plans are considered (as was done successfully by the urban agriculture forum in Harara, Zimbabwe and Villa Maria del Triunfo, Peru)
- ❖ Establishing relations with more permanent municipal staff and informing potential candidates on the MPAP process and on urban agriculture.



Envisioning urban agriculture in Rosario (photo: Raul Teville).

- ❖ Similarly, strengthening local farmer’s networks to support lobbying and implementation of the strategic city agenda. As mentioned before, the organisation and strengthening of an urban farmers network in Villa Maria del Triunfo-Lima, Peru has proven crucial in policy lobbying once a new Mayor was elected.
- ❖ Informing the wider public on urban agriculture in general and (eventual) shifts in policy.

of “bright spots” or demonstrations) early on in the MPAP process, for example during the planning stage, may be helpful in further development of the Strategic Agenda as it enhances the motivation of local actors for urban agriculture and the MPAP itself. It also provides the space for learning by doing, and thereby provides valuable information for further policy development and design of longer-term activities. RUAFF-CFF provides a small seed-fund for project pilot implementation in each of the RUAFF partner cities.

Integration of gender mainstreaming in development of the Strategic Agenda and project formulation should be further strengthened

The application of gender sensitive tools in situation analysis will deliver more detailed information on women’s circumstances, which will be vital to the further implementation of the local activities. However, integration of gender mainstreaming in development of the Strategic Agenda should be further strengthened, as to come to real formulation and implementation of gender-affirmative actions, that will make a difference in women’s lives.

Implementation of concrete activities early on in the planning process will help further development of the strategic agenda
Implementation of small concrete pilot activities (creation



Multistakeholder meeting with farmers, NGOs and local authorities (photo: Marielle Dubbeling).

PHASE 4: OPERATIONALISATION

Once the City Strategic Agenda has been developed and formally adopted, the next step will be to operationalise the city's strategic agenda by:

- a. Designing, budgeting and operational planning of **specific projects**
- b. Reformulating existing or designing alternative **by-laws, norms and regulations** regarding urban and peri-urban agriculture
- c. Developing proposals and operational planning of **integration of urban agriculture into institutional programmes, plans** (including city strategic development and zoning plans) **and budgets**.

Participatory design and (co)financing of projects

The focus lies here on participatory formulation of specific (peri)urban agriculture projects with local urban farmers and other local actors. Projects may include a variety of activities depending the specific problems and/or potentials to be tackled, but may include activities like:

- ❖ Studies (e.g. a marketing study); Exchange with other cities; Documentation of "good practices" in urban agriculture; Establishment of a "resource centre",
- ❖ (Participatory) Technology Development activities (to develop and test practical solutions for priority problems), demonstration plots and Farmer Field Schools,
- ❖ Training and technical assistance for farmers and agro-based small enterprises,
- ❖ Projects enhancing access to land/land improvement/ infrastructure development (farmers markets, composting sites, fences for community gardens, irrigation equipment, tools sheds, small processing plants, etcetera)
- ❖ Setting up of a Land Bank of Vacant Land Areas suitable for urban and peri-urban agriculture
- ❖ Projects enhancing access to water/rainwater harvesting/ irrigation techniques/safe reuse of wastewater,
- ❖ Projects regarding use of space confined technologies; land use intensification; soil fertility/ reuse of urban organic wastes/ transition to organic farming methods,
- ❖ Projects aiming at strengthening farmer organisations and networks and their strategic linkages for (a) advocacy: legalisation of (peri)urban agriculture, access to land/water, training and technical support, credit, subsidies and other economic incentives and (b) playing a role in training, cheaper input supply, processing,

Operationalisation of the City Strategic Agenda in RUAF partner cities

Projects and policy instruments on (peri)urban agriculture already developed by RUAF partner cities include:

- Setting up and supporting (management of) community gardens (Bulawayo-Zimbabwe and Villa Maria del Triunfo, Lima-Peru),
- Establishing farmer markets (Villa Maria del Triunfo, Lima-Peru),
- Strengthening of and training urban producer organisations, associations or cooperatives (Villa Maria del Triunfo, Lima-Peru and Beijing-China),
- Promotion of space confined technologies in school-gardens and high-density low income settlements (Hyderabad and Bangalore, India)
- Promoting agro-tourism enterprises (Beijing and Chengdu-China)
- Design and promotion of rooftop gardens (Bogota, Colombia)
- Implementing and monitoring of small-scale wastewater treatment systems for urban horticulture production (Pikine, Senegal)
- Development of education materials on urban agriculture (Accra-Ghana)
- Integrating urban agriculture into the city development and zoning plan (Beijing-China),
- Development of education materials on urban agriculture (Accra-Ghana)
- Integrating urban agriculture into the city development and zoning plans (Beijing-China) or into other sectoral policy documents (like the Food and Agriculture Sub-sector Development Policy II (FASDEP) document of the Ministry of Food and Agriculture in Ghana)
- Revision of outdated bye-laws on urban agriculture (Accra-Ghana and Bulawayo-Zimbabwe) and/or formulation of new bye-laws and ordinances on urban agriculture (Villa Maria del Triunfo, Lima- Peru)
- Provision of land and equipment for urban agriculture (Accra-Ghana; Bulawayo-Zimbabwe and Cape Town-South Africa)
- Providing economic incentives and inputs for urban agriculture (Cape Town-South Africa)
- Inclusion of urban agriculture curricula in extension institutes and universities (Hyderabad, India; Pikine-Senegal; Accra-Ghana; Bogota-Colombia).
- Inclusion of urban agriculture in the municipal budget (Cape Town-South Africa; Bobo Dioulasso-Burkina Faso).

Source: RUAF partner reports 2005-2007.

- ❖ marketing, credit provision to/for members,
 - ❖ Projects enhancing access to credit: groups savings and credit schemes, institutional micro-credit systems,
 - ❖ Projects improving processing and marketing,
 - ❖ Projects regarding the development of information and communication materials, organisation of information and training events,
 - ❖ Consumer education, etcetera.
- (See further *Working Paper No 2: on Key Issues and Course of Action for Municipal Policy Formulation on Urban Agriculture*).

(Re)formulation of norms, bye-laws and regulations

This activity may include:

- ❖ The adaptation of existing or formulation of new municipal bye-laws, norms and regulations on urban and peri-urban agriculture (legal policy instruments),
- ❖ The design and implementation of other policy instruments related to (peri)urban agriculture (economic, educational and design instruments – see

further *Working Paper No 2: Key issues and courses of action for municipal policy making on urban agriculture*).

Integration in Institutional Programmes and budgets

Specific attention should be given to ensure the sustainability and consolidation of the urban agriculture policy and programme beyond the period of a given political administration and to plan for future up-scaling of the urban agriculture programme: from working with a small group of beneficiaries, to working with a larger number of people; from working in one or a few districts of the city, to working in various districts. One way to enhance the continuity of the urban agriculture programme is by creating an institutional home for urban agriculture within the municipal structure and including it in the city's strategic development plan.

Another important point is to give sufficient attention on the integration of urban and peri-urban agriculture in

the institutional programmes of the various institutional stakeholders participating in the multi-stakeholder forum (including the municipality) and assigning a special budget to it. The participating university can, for example, take on the development of training curricula on urban agriculture; a credit cooperative may be willing to open a credit line for urban agriculture; while an NGO can provide technical training to urban producers.

Institutionalisation could thus include:

- ❖ The development of new structures of financial



*A need for promoting safe use of wastewater
(Photo Marielle Dubbeling).*

management and allocation of resources (example setting up of a rotating credit fund, channelling public subsidies),

- ❖ Setting up new structures that facilitate participation (task groups, working groups),
- ❖ Setting up specific urban agriculture programmes or units within different institutions.

Lessons learned regarding operationalisation

Shared budgeting is crucial for operationalisation and implementation of the City Strategic Agenda

From the beginning of the MPAP, it should be made very clear that the local partners are responsible for (financing) the implementation of the City Strategic Agenda. The experiences to date indicate that it is crucial to first build on the resources and means available in the organisations and institutions participating in the MSF through joint budgeting and inclusion of priority actions in the annual operational plans and budgets of these organisations and institutions. This requires explaining how (some of) the

strategic actions are relevant to their institutional work.

Project planning and design should go hand in hand with policy review and formulation

During operationalisation, in general more and specific emphasis needs to be given to other measures than action projects, e.g. the revision of norms and regulations, integration of urban agriculture into zonification and city development plans, etcetera. Additionally, when planning the revision of bye-laws, norms and regulations, many cities tend to emphasise legal instruments, which often have a reactive character (action is taken only in the form of sanctions if legal rules and regulations are not followed properly by the social actors). In such cities urban agriculture is often restricted or at best tolerated if the capacity of the city to enforce the existing regulations is too limited. The use of economic, educative and design instruments however have to be combined with supporting legal instruments in an effective “package” of policy measures in order to arrive at a development-oriented policy on urban agriculture.

Differentiation of the policy measures for the different types of agriculture is important

Many (peri)urban agriculture policy documents hardly differentiate between policy measures for various types of urban agriculture existing in a city, with the general exception of the policy measures regarding urban livestock production. Differentiation of the policy measures for the different types of agriculture (according to main product, level of technology and scale) is important since each type of (peri)urban agriculture has specific characteristics, development potentials and support needs and hence require different intervention strategies for their development. However, this is hardly practiced so far.

PHASE 5: IMPLEMENTATION, MONITORING AND INNOVATION

Implementation of the developed projects and revised norms, bye-laws and regulations

Implementation of projects and revised norms and regulations should be coordinated and regularly monitored by the multi-stakeholder forum or delegated to a specific committee. In the latter case, progress and results are regularly communicated back to the MSF and result in the revision of operational plans or definition of new projects and policy instruments.

Participatory monitoring and evaluation

Designing participatory monitoring and evaluation procedures is an integral part of any MPAP and their application should start at an early moment in the process. Practical methods for process, outcome and impact monitoring have to be defined; time and funds have to be set aside for this purpose; and arrangements have to be made for monitoring and evaluation of the activities of the various actors undertaken in the context of the municipal urban agriculture policy and programme.

Three modes of monitoring and evaluation are applied in RUAF-CFF (see also *Working Paper No 11: Participatory monitoring and evaluation of urban agriculture projects and policies*):

Built-in monitoring

In all main activities implemented by RUAF partners, a monitoring component will be built in, in order to be able to measure **progress** (did we do what we planned to do), **process** (how did we do it) and **direct results** or **outputs** (number of participants, publications, etc.). Such built-in monitoring thus allows for the review and improvement (adaptation and innovation) of the strategies and methodologies used in the MPAP by documenting and sharing lessons learned concerning both successes and failures.

Impact Monitoring

This concerns the measurement of the impacts of the RUAF-CFF programme at target group level (changes in the livelihood situation of the people attended by the interventions of the RUAF regional and local partners). RUAF has developed easy-to-measure and realistic indicators to monitor the impacts of urban agriculture projects and other policy measures on food security and nutrition, income and employment generation, social inclusion of

marginal groups, their organisation and improved access to productive resources, enhanced recycling of urban wastes and urban greening, etc. and are seeking to apply them more consistently. This also allow the stakeholders to keep track of the impacts of the activities implemented and evaluate the degree to which these correspond with the objectives of City Strategic Agenda (for example contributions to poverty alleviation and food security), as well as communicate successful efforts to a wider public, and create opportunities for further change.

Outcome Mapping

Next to impact monitoring, also attention is needed for participatory monitoring of the **changes in the behaviour** (actions, relations, cooperation and communications, etc.) of the people, groups and organizations with whom a programme works directly (boundary partners) and which can be logically linked to a programme's activities (although they may not be necessarily directly caused by them). This is why the local partners involved in the RUAF programme also apply instruments, from the start of the MPAP, to periodically review the communication and cooperation between the stakeholders, and progress made in the realisation of the various commitments of the partners involved. They analyse changes that have come about in the various participating organisations, the degree of participation of the intended beneficiaries and gender considerations. To do this they apply methods such as

Planning, implementation and monitoring of policy guidelines in Beijing, China

Acceleration of the planning process on peri-urban agriculture is currently a main task for local governmental agencies in Beijing, China. In order to achieve this aim, close collaboration and coordination between various departments and officials is necessary, as well as direct involvement of urban farmers, enterprises and the agro-tourism association amongst others. Local governments will strengthen monitoring and management of the implementation of these activities and an impact evaluation system will be established. Participatory and self-evaluation is a necessary part of this system.

Source: Cai, Jianming. RUAF Progress Report 2006. Institute of Geographical Sciences and Natural Resource Research of the Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China.

“participatory change monitoring” and “outcome mapping” (Earl *et al.*, 2001).

In all three cases, monitoring and evaluation can benefit from including both internal and external viewpoints and should be developed with a gender perspective.

Lessons learned regarding implementation, monitoring and evaluation

MPAPs can be implemented under varying local conditions

Experiences to date indicate that the MPAP process is well possible under varying local conditions (city scale, socio-political system, degree of urban agriculture development), but that adaptation of the MPAP process to the local conditions is important for its success.

Provision of specific technical training required for project implementation proves to be very important

Technical training required for project implementation (for example training regarding certain production technologies, in processing or marketing) of projects identified in the City Strategic Agenda proves to be very important, but requires substantial additional resources (staff time and funds). Such additional training activities could already be incorporated in the City Strategic Agenda and local research and

extension organisations and NGO’s should be mobilised to provide such training (as done for example by AREX and SNV Bulawayo-Zimbabwe, the Department of Horticulture in Hyderabad-India, or the Department of Agriculture in Beijing-China).

The development and institutionalisation of a MPAP should go hand in hand with the development and institutionalisation of urban agriculture.

At the end it is hoped that MPAPs may become a key element in building participatory and democratic governance in involved cities and institutions, and facilitate change through processes of public participation policy formulation, action planning and implementation.

Monitoring of the implementation of the City Strategic Agenda remains a challenge

Especially project impact monitoring is a real challenge due to relatively high costs (time, funds) as compared to project budgets. Monitoring of non-RUAF co-funded activities by local partners (as included in the City Strategic Agenda) depends on their willingness to cooperate and invest in monitoring and evaluation. These partners should thus be able to recognise the value of monitoring and evaluation for their own learning and institutional programmes.



Action Planning by the team in Accra (photo: Theophilus Otchere-Larbi).

Case Study Accra, Ghana

T. Otchere-Larbi

International Water Management Institute-IWMI, Ghana

The Multi-stakeholder Policy formulation and Action Planning (MPAP) approach is well adapted to the decentralisation and multi-stakeholder processes in local governance in Ghana. Political decentralisation in Ghana started in 1988 when 110 Metropolitan, Municipal and District assemblies (MMDAs) were established, which was further expanded in 1994 with the establishment of the sub-metropolitan district councils, urban, zonal and town councils and unit committees. The major intention to decentralise has been to share power with the districts as a means of advancing participatory democracy and collective decision making, and the restructuring of power relations between the centre and the District assemblies, in addition to other societal stake-holding sectors. In line with this was the introduction of a new decentralised planning system in 1994 by the National Development Planning Commission (NDPC). The main objective was to establish efficient political, planning and administrative institutions at the MMDA level, which would enjoy popular support of local communities and facilitate the mobilisation of support and resources for district development.

MPAP IN ACCRA

Following the general MPAP process as described in this working paper, the first step in the MPAP was to identify a group of key partners and organisations and create

the needed local ownership, commitment and inclusive consensus. Regular consultations were made with the full range of local partners through office visits, telephone calls and meetings. This stage of the process requires continued stakeholder engagement and follow-ups. Stakeholders would have to be constantly contacted through office visits, telephone calls, and sometimes, through informal meetings to explain and discuss the process and to arouse interest.

Whilst the initial focus was on key or lead stakeholders, including the Accra Metropolitan Food and Agriculture Department, the Accra Metropolitan Health Department, the Department of Geography and Resource Development of the University of Ghana and the Science and Technology Policy Research Institute (STEPRI), more diverse groups of stakeholders were identified and engaged as the process gained momentum. A major challenge during this phase was finding ways and means to identify and involve representatives of vulnerable and marginalised groups who were typically not well organised in order to be truly “inclusive”. Beyond having a representative from one vegetable farmers group, and another livestock farmer, other groups’ representatives are not yet included in the MPAP team.

A core team comprising representatives from nine stakeholder institutions was constituted in 2005 and a “Multi-stakeholder Agreement” was signed, which highlighted what the various partner institutions agreed to do together, what resources they wished to contribute

and how urban agriculture could be brought into the development agenda. A major challenge here was to get representatives to attend meetings regularly. Earlier notices were given and reminders sent to members few days to the meeting. Meeting venues were also rotated among institutions to ensure active participation and interest.

After the 3-day Regional Trainer of Trainers (ToT) and a 10-day MPAP training with 25 participants, drawn from key stakeholder institutions in Accra, members of the core team conducted the situational analysis of the urban agriculture related activities in the Accra Metropolitan Area (AMA). Cultivated and cultivable land areas in the city were identified and characterised, a typology of vacant spaces was elaborated, land use maps were made based on information from urban producers and other representatives, and production systems were identified, as well as their locations and main features, the legal frameworks and policies, and the needs and viewpoints of the actors involved.

This study enabled the collection of key data, understanding the policy and institutional context, and in identifying problems and development potentials, and the interventions for action. A synthesis document, containing the key issues on urban agriculture, was used to inform the various and larger group of stakeholders in more detail and to advance in the planning process with the stakeholders. The draft synthesis was circulated among some selected stakeholders and experts for further study and discussions. At the end of the exercise, agreement was reached on the issues and a final report (the Policy Narrative) was prepared for discussion at the multi-stakeholder forum.

Lack of data and unreliability of data posed challenges in this phase of the process. These challenges, in certain cases were solved through primary data collection. In other cases, projections and adjustments were made using available data. For example, current satellite maps of Accra were not available; there was a lack of data on existing farmer groups, etc. These situations meant that more time was required to undertake primary data collection and analysis.

A 3-day Multi-stakeholder Forum for Action Planning was held after the situation analysis and circulation of the policy narrative. Up to 55 participants were at the forum and included key stakeholders, represented by both technical staff and directors (decision makers) of public institutions, farmer group representatives, NGOs and political heads of the AMA and adjoining districts. This initial large scale consultation not only aimed to mobilise a wide range of stakeholders and deepen their knowledge and understanding of the importance of urban agriculture in urban economic development, but also to agree on common problems and potentials for urban agriculture, and subsequent identify priority issues for intervention and on mechanisms for addressing them. The forum was also used to draw legitimacy from the expressed collective will of the participating stakeholders and individuals to develop a City Strategic Agenda on urban agriculture in Accra.

At this forum the composition of the core MPAP team was expanded into a 15-member Working Group AWGUPA (Accra Working Group on Urban Agriculture). Its mandate was, amongst others, to further elaborate a detailed Action Plan and develop a pilot project proposal for implementation, operationalisation of agreements reached at the multi-

From awareness to action: policies on urban agriculture in Accra

More than 40 percent of Ghana's 20 million people lived in urban areas in the year 2000, while the country's urban population was growing at an estimated 4 percent per annum. This increase is taking place at a time when the rural population is aging and agricultural productivity in the rural areas is declining. As a result, an increasing number of city dwellers have resorted to urban agriculture, using urban runoff/wastewater and vacant open spaces for food production. To promote these activities contributing to the food supply, employment creation and livelihood support in Accra, the Accra Metropolitan Assembly needs to pass supportive legislation and promote urban agriculture development rather than advancing only prohibitive bye-laws. It was in this context that a MPAP was started in 2005, under the coordination of IWMI-Ghana.

Source: Obirih-Opareh, N. and T. Otchere Larbi, 2006. From awareness to action: policies on urban agriculture in Accra. In: "Urban Agriculture Magazine 16: Formulating effective policies on urban agriculture". RUAF Foundation, Leusden, the Netherlands

stakeholder forum, and developing the identified strategies further. AWGUPA prioritised eight policy and technical issues for intervention in a short- to medium-term (3-5 years) vision on the desired development in Accra: the City Strategic Action plan on Urban and Peri-urban Agriculture.


**Statements of Vision on
Urban and Peri-urban Agriculture (UPA) in Accra**

- UPA plays an important complementary role to rural agriculture in contributing to food security, employment and income generation, especially for the urban poor.
- While contributing to livelihoods and food security, it is recognized that UPA faces numerous challenges and constraints such as limited availability of land, access to safe water and other production resources, and market constraints.
- There is the need to overcome current and emerging challenges facing UPA by coordinating all stakeholders, streamlining its operations and creating an enabling environment for its sustainability
- As urban population soars, the role of UPA in supplying perishable food to cities of Africa becomes increasingly important and needs a supportive policy and legislative framework.
- Overcoming the challenge calls for the recognition of UPA in the sector ministries and agencies and for policies to effectively integrate UPA in urban planning and development.

Statement of Consensus

We Call for the promotion of a shared vision on UPA that takes into account the specific needs and conditions in the country and urge Policy makers, in partnership with Development Partners, to develop gender sensitive policies and appropriate instruments that will create an enabling environment for integrating and supporting UPA into our economies

Endorsed by the participants in the presence of:



Honourable Clement Eledi
Deputy Minister of Food and Agriculture

Subsequently, a Policy Seminar was organized which brought together people in key policy making positions (Directors of Municipal and District Assemblies, District Chief Executives of 3 districts of the Greater Accra Region, Directors of the CSIR and IWMI, the press, Deputy Minister of Food and Agriculture, etc) who could influence policy and follow up on the outcomes of the Forum. Participants discussed and endorsed a **Statement of Consensus** (see box). In support of this statement of consensus, the Deputy Minister pronounced the institution of an award for the “National Best Urban Farmer” during the yearly-organised National Farmers day celebration.

The AWGUPA was also officially inaugurated during this seminar and a first pilot project entitled “Promoting public education and policy support for urban and periurban agriculture in Accra” launched. IWMI continued to offer coordinating support to the AWGUPA and organises meetings for information exchange, reporting and planning next steps.

THE PILOT PROJECT

In 2006 and 2007, the AWGUPA implemented a series of awareness creation programmes to educate the general public on the importance of agriculture in the city. The programmes aim to raise public awareness on food production and food safety. The media have been engaged to design and implement these programmes. This should help remove some of the negative perceptions the public has about urban agriculture. Farmers are also being provided with extension information on good agricultural practices, on improved post-harvest handling strategies, on environmental sanitation and personal hygiene. The working group also developed a comprehensive policy paper on urban agriculture in Accra and supports the review of AMA’s bye-laws and other official documents (see also Box on Review of bye-laws).

Review of bye-laws to make them urban agriculture friendly

The current AMA bye-laws related to urban agriculture are of a restrictive character. The dominant perception was that urban agriculture practices compromises public health and food safety and prohibitive and restrictive laws against urban agriculture are the best option. The bye-laws require an urban agriculture practitioner to register with the metropolitan assembly, and to observe certain restrictions regarding the permissible size of a farm, the type of crops that can be grown, the type of water to use, the number of birds, goats and sheep that can be reared in a dwelling place and where cattle and swine can be reared. In practice however, almost none of the urban agriculture activities are ever registered, nor do they meet the municipal regulations concerning them. However both the multi-stakeholder forum and policy seminar reached general consensus on the need for promotion of urban agriculture development in Accra. AMA has now started reviewing its bye-laws to make them urban agriculture friendly.

Source: Obirih-Opareh, N. and T. Otchere Larbi, 2006. From awareness to action: policies on urban agriculture in Accra. In: “Urban Agriculture Magazine 16: Formulating effective policies on urban agriculture”. RUAF Foundation, Leusden, the Netherlands

SUMMARY OF RESULTS AND OUTCOMES

In Accra a functional 15-member multi-stakeholder team, the Accra Working Group on Urban and Peri-urban Agriculture (AWGUPA) has been established for Accra. The team receives official recognition from the Ministry of Food and Agriculture and the Accra Metropolitan Assembly (AMA), the two key political and policy institutions. To ensure that the MPAP process is sustained, IWMI/RUAF continues working with the various stakeholders towards mainstreaming the process. Progress of institutionalisation of the process is monitored through outcome journals and capacity gaps are addressed in capacity building events. Other events of “reaching up” (up-scaling) and “reaching out” (out-scaling) include study visits.

The following are major outcomes of the past two years:

- ❖ A short term City Strategic Agenda on Urban Agriculture has been developed for Accra. The strategic agenda will also be used to source for funding or integrated into specific institutional development agenda.
- ❖ The Ministry of Food and Agriculture approved and instituted an award system for the Best National Urban Farmer. Consequently, the first ever National Best Urban Farmer Award was awarded to a farmer in Accra during the 22nd National Farmers Day in December 2006.
- ❖ The AMA adopted a motion to develop an agenda on urban agriculture in Accra. Consequently, the Agricultural sub-Committee of the Accra Metropolitan Assembly has initiated a review of its by-laws on urban agriculture in the metropolis.
- ❖ Similarly, the Ministry of Food and Agriculture has also integrated urban agriculture into the development of the Food and Agriculture Sub-sector Development Policy II (FASDEP) document.
- ❖ The concept of MPAP process has also been introduced to the College of Agriculture and Consumer Sciences (CACS) and the Department of Geography and Resource Development, both of the University of Ghana, with a longer term aim of integrating such novel concepts and practices into relevant curricula. CACS has established a “desk” for urban agriculture to provide research, training and information on urban agriculture to students. The Department of Geography and Resource Development is in advanced stages of including urban agriculture in their departmental seminars and incorporating it in topics of their curricula during the academic year starting in September 2007.

LESSONS LEARNT

The MPAP process requires adequate time for institutionalisation. Beyond the technical issues, on urban agriculture, the group members’ knowledge on working as a team, participatory processes and principles, managing conflicts, and managing participatory multi-stakeholder processes needed to be developed. Tailored training on these issues, also including management and leadership styles and project management were organised for the MPAP members. Members of the working group also require skills in policy formulation, advocacy and lobbying for policy change, as well as understanding the policy formulation process. A training programme in that direction is required.

It is difficult to differentiate the level of participation as arising from individual versus institutional interest and commitment. But it is clear that the process is dependent on both individual and institutional interests and commitment. Some stakeholders expect monetary benefits in lending their inputs to the process, especially when they are not convinced that the process has a clear benefit to their own work. This situation is somehow aggravated by seemingly overburdened members with other institutional responsibilities. Members are more committed if they are assessed on their performance in the MPAP process as part of their institutional performance assessment criteria.

The process involves documenting, analysing and disseminating a wide range of learning from stakeholders. This is very demanding and requires expertise. The selection and application of different tools and methods to promote processes of learning among all partner institutions is crucial. Methods and tools used under the process in Accra included; internet links, bibliographic database, flyers, newsletters, posters, workshop reports, project updates, etc. A major challenge is inadequate internet connectivity. This was circumvented through distribution of hard copies of information through postal and personal deliveries, as well as during meetings. The process requires regular consultations (through office visits, telephone calls, reminders, etc) and combination of both formal and informal relations to get the buy-in of stakeholders and to establish relations beyond technical issues, e.g. inviting some stakeholders to luncheons, cocktails, etc. The packaging of information into CD-ROMs, videos and other forms by the RUAF team require specialised skills and training.

The process depends on building consensus through broader consultations which is time consuming. It is a challenge to achieve the expected changes in policy and institutionalisation

in a short period of time. In Accra, the first two years were needed to create the necessary awareness and establish the framework for take-off of the policy change.

The implementation of the MPAP requires an anchor institution to spearhead the process. In Accra, despite the inputs provided by a number of institutions (like the Ministry of Food and Agriculture and STEPRI), no institute has taken up this function as of yet, and IWMI still continues to facilitate the process. There has been mixed reaction among stakeholders for fear of not being able to facilitate the process.

A memorandum of understanding (MoU) was developed and signed among stakeholders. The MoU spells out the areas

and modalities for collaboration. However, it does not have any legal implications and does not ensure commitment. It could be more effective in situations when there are financial commitments and deliverables expected among stakeholders.

The MPAP approach can be used to affect a paradigm shift in the thinking and planning of agricultural development in the city. However, to ensure that the participatory decision making process and policy formulation is widely understood, accepted and integrated through routine application, steady and progressive institutional changes and adaptations that will modify attitudes, institutional structures and organisational behaviour is required.



Community Gardening in Villa Maria del Triunfo (photo: René van Veenhuizen).

Case Study Lima, Peru

G. Merzthal
IPES-Peru

As a result of increasing urbanisation in Peru, especially in metropolitan Lima, coupled to increasing urban poverty, urban agriculture can be a promising alternative in contributing to poverty alleviation and local economic development. The district of Villa Maria del Triunfo is located at the outskirts of Lima and has a current population of over 367,000 inhabitants. As many as 57% of the population lives in poverty, while 22% live in extreme poverty. Fifteen (15) percent of the population suffers from malnutrition and at least 23 percent of children under eight suffer from chronic malnutrition. It is in this context that the municipality created in 1999 a strategy in order to improve urban food security, by complementing and diversifying the quantity of food consumption and facilitating the generation of supplementary family income through urban agriculture. The authorities of Villa Maria del Triunfo incorporated urban agriculture in their city's Integrated Development Plan (2001-2010) and created in Municipal Urban Agriculture and Environmental protection Programme (PAU) as part of the Department for Local Economic Development. The initial urban agriculture programme was however, similar to the case of Bulawayo-Zimbabwe (see also in this working paper), developed by a small group of political actors only and not based on a more solid analysis of the situation of urban agriculture in the city. Nor, and as a result of their lack of participation in the process, did it sufficiently respond to the real needs and priority issues

of the different groups of urban producers. Finally, human and financial resources of the municipality were scarce and limited in implementing the proposed programme. In 2005, the Municipality of Villa Maria del Triunfo, with the support of IPES/RUAF, started revising its urban agriculture policy and programme and began formulation a Strategic Plan for Urban Agriculture in order to make the policy more operational.

MPAP IN VILLA MARIA DEL TRIUNFO

The MPAP in Lima included the active participation of urban producers and other local key stakeholders. The process includes 4 stages:

1. Strengthening of local capacities

This stage looked at strengthening the capacities of decision makers, municipal and NGO's technical staff, and university representatives, for the design and implementation of the MPAP process. A policy seminar and an exchange to the city of Rosario (Argentina) were realized in order to increase the knowledge and understanding of the highest municipal decision makers (mayors, directors) about the impact of urban agriculture on cities' management and to reinforce their commitment to the development of the multi-stakeholders process. Additionally, a series of MPAP training workshops were organised for municipal technicians and promoters, and technicians of IPES to reinforce their understanding of urban agriculture and its impacts, and to strengthen their capacities for the design and implementation of the MPAP. The training consisted of four blocks held in September, October and November 2005 and March 2006.

2. Situation analysis

Upon finalisation of the training activities, the local team implemented a participatory diagnosis on urban agriculture as basis for further action planning. The diagnosis in Villa Maria del Triunfo involved four components: a) stakeholders' identification and analysis, b) analysis of urban agriculture farming systems, c) mapping of potential vacant land for urban agriculture and d) analysis of the normative and legal framework related to the activity. The diagnosis was concluded in May of 2006, resulting in the publication of a short policy narrative on "Villa Maria: farming for life".

3. Action Planning

After having concluded the diagnosis, the process for the elaboration of the City Strategic Action Plan on urban agriculture began. This included the creation of a multi-stakeholder forum for dialogue, agreement and decision-making in June. The city forum included all the stakeholders identified in the diagnosis and is formed by 20 organisations and institutions (such as universities, NGOs, CBOs, national government institutions, international organisations, such as the FAO, and private businesses). The Strategic Plan was formulated based on the analysis of quantitative and qualitative information on urban agriculture, and the assessment of the needs, perceptions and current practices of the urban producers, conducted during the participatory situation analysis. The process allowed for the definition of key issues and intervention strategies to overcome identified problems and promote the potentials of urban agriculture in Villa Maria. The plan started looking at how to strengthen and consolidate the existing activities and how to optimise available human and financial resources

in favour of urban agriculture (see further box below). The plan was finalised and approved in September 2006 and the first pilot projects were implemented from October 2006 onwards.

4. Implementation

The multi-stakeholders platform prioritised those activities of the strategic plan to be implemented in the short term in form of pilot/demonstration projects and that will also give further input to the revision and formulation of the normative and legal framework facilitating integration of urban agriculture in public policies.

PILOT ACTIVITIES

Several of the pilot activities implemented –with funding of RUAFA as well as from the participating local stakeholders include:

Strengthening of an urban agriculture producers' network

The urban farmers are organized on 2 levels: on the level of each 7 zones in Villa Maria and on district level. Principles and values of the network have been defined with the producers, roles of zonal and district coordinators agreed upon and action plans developed. Training was organised technical production aspects (for example organic and arid farming methodologies), nutritional awareness (cooking recipes), personal relations and organizational capacities. Practical information materials for urban producers are being produced, in collaboration with the Agricultural University in Lima. The producers organisation played a critical role in lobbying for continued political support for urban agriculture, after changes in the municipality (Mayor and municipal council) took place.

Strategic Plan on Urban Agriculture

The Villa Maria Strategic Plan on Urban Agriculture aims to contribute to the 2010 city vision for a healthy, productive and food secure city. It identifies 6 key areas for the development of urban agriculture:

1. Strengthening of the awareness of the urban population on the benefits of urban agriculture
2. Development of technical and managerial capacities of urban producers
3. Improving access to and the rational use of water for urban agriculture
4. Improving local production and marketing of urban agriculture
5. Strengthening the institutional and normative framework for development of urban agriculture in the district
6. Facilitating access to information on and financing for urban agriculture.

Source: Municipality of Villa Maria del Triunfo and IPES, 2007. *Villa Maria: farming for life: Concerted Strategic Plan for Urban Agriculture in Villa Maria del Triunfo (2007-2011)*.

Participatory development of a product logo

Together with the farmers a logo was developed to represent urban agriculture products from Villa Maria and constitutes a differentiating element in marketing the produce.

Producers were asked to draw their own logos and based on identification of common elements, one common logo was designed. In a next phase of the process, consumer awareness and trust in these products have to be generated through dissemination, social certification and possibly regular quality control (by a food institute or laboratory).

Marketing of urban agriculture produce

A first market study was implemented trying to identify: What can be produced? What will be bought? What will profit margins be? And how and to whom to sell? The market study and economic analysis focused basically on local markets (farmers market, sale in the garden and food-kitchens) and resulted in a proposed planting and production scheme and marketing plan for various community gardens. Production and marketing of vegetables currently only allow for additional income (around 30 US\$/month) considering the small production units (100 m²). Especially costs of water are high. Some products are more profitable (flowers, seedlings) but a market cannot easily be found.

Setting up of 3 community garden units

This activity is implemented in collaboration and with financial support of REP (Red Electrica Peru). 3 garden units have been/are being established on vacant areas of land located under electricity lines. Gardens are fenced, a small covered area for training, meetings and sale is put up and water-tanks are placed (water is provided by the Municipality). Where needed terraces are build. The projects are considered “pilots” in the sense that: community gardening was not common in Villa Maria before, nor was the application of organic production techniques, planning of produce oriented at marketing and public-private partnerships supporting their development. The project involves in total 29 families (75 beneficiaries). A first garden unit was established at the start of the MPAP process to motivate the process and bring out lessons learned for further development of the Strategic Plan. The second and third garden unit took into account lessons learned and aimed to test out new production systems (expanding from 100-300 m²/family). They will also serve as demonstration and training centres for other families.

The organisation of an “urban agriculture week”

In August 2007 an urban agriculture week was organised to further increase awareness on and public support for urban agriculture. The urban gardens could be visited, short workshops followed, videos on urban agriculture were shown and discussion fora organised.

The elaboration of a municipal ordinance on urban agriculture

A municipal ordinance on urban agriculture was elaborated and approved in 2007, in order to recognize urban agriculture as a permanent and legitimate activity in the district and as an anti-poverty strategy which contributes to food security, the generation of complementary income for the farming families of the farmers, urban and environmental improvement, social inclusion and equity (see further the related box).

Municipal ordinance of urban agriculture

The ordinance seeks to:

- Promote the participatory design and implementation of plans and policy agendas for urban agriculture, and their linkage with public administration plans and mechanisms, such as: the comprehensive city plan, the economic development plan, the urban development plan and other sectoral plans.
- Promote and strengthen the organization of urban farmers as main implementers and stakeholders in urban agriculture.
- Encourage the creation and strengthening of multi-stakeholder and multi-institutional spaces for networking and consensus-building in favor of urban agriculture.
- Create and strengthen a specific entity within the municipal structure for urban agriculture (a sub-department), which has the necessary human and financial resources to promote and strengthen urban agriculture practices in the city.
- Include urban agriculture in land use plans, promoting the productive use of vacant spaces and access to land for the poorest residents of the city.
- Promote access to financing for urban producers, linked with the participatory budget, and provide technical support and follow-up.
- Promote the consumption of safe, healthy, pollutant-free food stemming from crop cultivation, animal-raising and food processing activities in urban agriculture.

RESULTS AND OUTCOMES

- ❖ Almost 300 poor farming families have been mobilised and organised and have participated actively in the process of designing, planning and implementation of strategic activities on urban agriculture.
- ❖ Three new community gardens were implemented.
- ❖ A network of urban farmers in Villa Maria del Triunfo was formed.
- ❖ The policy and decision makers of the Municipality of Villa Maria del Triunfo are aware of the potentials (and risks) of urban agriculture for income generation and poverty alleviation, sustainable urban development and urban food security. As a result they have integrated urban agriculture into their municipal's political agenda (City Development Plan). The municipal programme on urban agriculture now counts with 5 permanent staff and an annual budget of USD 55,000 for operational expenses.
- ❖ Access of the population to land and water for urban agriculture is being promoted. Community gardens on vacant areas in the city (lands under high voltage cables or on steep slopes) are being promoted.
- ❖ A multi-stakeholder platform for the different actors, named Forum on Urban Agriculture and Food Security of Villa Maria del Triunfo was established.
- ❖ Private and public organizations are elaborating and implementing joint urban agriculture programs and provide urban producers with suitable services (training, credit, enterprise development, market information, veterinary services, production quality control, etc.).
- ❖ A Strategic Plan for Urban Agriculture (2007-2011), was formulated and is being implemented.

LESSONS LEARNT

Raising awareness among decision makers and other stakeholders of the potential of urban agriculture to alleviate hunger and poverty is a key activity in promoting urban-agriculture-friendly policies. This can be accomplished through local seminars that present urban agriculture experiences (from other cities in the country or abroad), exchange visits, technical interchanges, etc. It is also important to raise awareness among decision makers of the situation of urban agriculture and urban producers. Dialogue with and participation of producers in the aforementioned activities is needed to expose gaps and jointly seek solutions. Although the awareness raising process is costly and requires much time and effort on the part of promoters, this activity is crucial in the formulation of urban agriculture policy at city level.

In order to operationalise the development of concrete activities for urban agriculture promotion, it is essential to



Strengthening of the organisation of urban farmers is important (here in Accra). (photo: René van Veenhuizen).


institutionalise urban agriculture, through its incorporation into the normative frameworks of cities (such as in their development plans), through the development of specific policies and legal frameworks (municipal ordinances, laws, regulations) for urban agriculture that facilitate and regulate its practice, and/or through the creation of municipal structures (units, departments, etc.)

The role of the local government in such processes is thus a key factor. However it is necessary to count with a capable facilitator and “lead organisation” in the dialogue and decision taking during the process to avoid the excessive influence of some actors, lack of objectivity and the exclusion of non-organized groups or minorities. Additionally, sufficient financial and human resources should be assigned to the process.

Equally important is the strengthening of organisational, managerial, technical and networking capacities of urban farmers. A consolidated and strong organisation is better equipped to cope with the withdrawal of political support from the municipality. The organization and empowerment of urban farmers proved vital in Villa Maria to guarantee the sustainability of the process after municipal elections and political changes (Merzthal, Prain and Soto, 2006).

Reference

Merzthal, G. G. Prain and N. Soto, 2006. Integration of urban agriculture in municipal agenda: experiences from Lima, Peru. In: “Urban Agriculture Magazine 16: Formulating effective policies on urban agriculture”. RUAF Foundation, Leusden, the Netherlands.



The mayor of Bulawayo, Mr. Ndabeni Ncube addressing the stakeholder forum meeting in Bulawayo (photo: MDP).

Case Study Bulawayo, Zimbabwe

T. Mubvami

Municipal Development Partnership-MDP, Zimbabwe

Bulawayo is Zimbabwe's second largest city. Once Zimbabwe's industrial hub, the city has lost most of its major industries, through outright closure or relocation to the capital city, Harare. The city is thus home to a relatively poor urban population, compared to the population of Harare. A policy framework on urban agriculture is under development since 1996, when the city council recognised the emerging phenomenon of urban farming and took a decision to improve it for the benefit of its residents. A draft policy was adopted in 2000 (see box). Five years later however, no single activity had been implemented. Various reasons were identified, but included the fact that urban agriculture had no specific institutional home and no specific staff was dedicated to the activity. Also, the draft policy was not properly integrated into urban development plans and failed to deal with critical issues of incentives for urban farmers. As a result of active involvement of NGOs and farmer organisations in its development, it lacked operational strategies on how problems related to access to land, water and finances should be tackled. The debate on urban agriculture was revived in the context of the RUAF-MPAP process, aiming to revisit the policy and to address the issues mentioned above.

The policy document on urban agriculture

The 2000 policy document defines urban agriculture as "a system of land use for agricultural purposes within the urban environment for crop and animal husbandry." It therefore recognises urban agriculture in its broad sense and does not limit it to crop cultivation. The policy also recognises that urban agriculture is widespread in the city and is a major land use activity with immense socioeconomic benefits to the residents. It recognises urban agriculture as an industry that should be supported and organised. In Bulawayo, as well as in Zimbabwe in general, urban agriculture is seen as illegal or unwanted, so the intention of the policy is to legalise the activity in certain designated areas within the city. The objectives mentioned in the policy document are to identify suitable land and allocate it to deserving people (i.e. the elderly, women and youths), promote the utilisation of urban wastewater, support the activity (with proper extension services, finances and project appraisals) and above all to make sure that the activity is properly coordinated.

Source: T. Mubvami, 2006. The policy framework and practice of urban agriculture in Bulawayo. In: "Urban Agriculture Magazine 16: Formulating effective policies on urban agriculture". RUAF Foundation, Leusden, the Netherlands.

MPAP IN BULAWAYO

Several partners are involved in the implementation of the MPAP in Bulawayo. These include:

- ❖ Bulawayo City Council (BCC) – beneficiary and implementation of the project on the ground.
- ❖ Municipal Development Partnership for Eastern and Southern Africa (MDPESA) – the regional coordinator of the RUAF programme and providing training, technical assistance and funding support to BCC and other stakeholders.
- ❖ Zimbabwe Environment Lawyers Association (ZELA), providing assistance in revising and developing the legislative and policy framework.
- ❖ Institute of Water, Sanitation and Development (IWSD), providing technical assistance in waste water reuse in urban agriculture in Bulawayo.
- ❖ Environment Africa (E Africa), providing support regarding the environmental aspects of the project.
- ❖ SNV, providing support regarding economic and social aspects of urban agriculture and financing part some of the action plans developed.

These organizations formed a core team that led the implementation of the process.

The MPAP started in April 2005 with a reconnaissance visit to urban agriculture sites in Bulawayo. These visits were very important in gaining an insight into the current situation with regard to urban agriculture in the city. During these visits information regarding the information and training needs of the potential beneficiaries was collected.

In May 2005, an inception workshop for Bulawayo Councillors and Chief Officers was held. The main objectives of the workshop were to:

- ❖ Introduce the RUAF urban agriculture programme and the objectives and approach of the MPAP for Bulawayo,
- ❖ Introduce the main partners on the project,
- ❖ Get inputs from council on proposed process and activities,
- ❖ Get insights into potential pilot projects to be developed, and
- ❖ Agree on the way forward.

Following this workshop, an Urban Agriculture Stakeholder Forum was convened and attended by over fifty representatives of various stakeholder groups. The objectives and terms of reference for the forum were discussed and agreed upon so that the forum could guide the further development and implementation of an urban

agriculture agenda for the city. The forum members, including local and central government officials, NGOs, farmers associations, researchers and members of the business community, have received training to help them define problems, opportunities and policy issues, in order to frame and implement plans of action. It was also agreed that membership would be open to all those who had an interest in urban agriculture. The need for effective communication channels with council was emphasized in discussions on the proposed structure of the forum. In order to enhance this communication, it was agreed that the forum reports to the standing committee of council on Town Lands and Planning. The forum is chaired by a councillor from this committee. Various sub-committees/working groups were set up to work on specific activities related to urban agriculture development.

After a regional Training of Trainers (ToT) workshop (November 2005), members of the core team were trained in the MPAP process and an exploratory survey/baseline study undertaken. The survey incorporated participatory tools like community mapping and focus group discussions. It covered a range of thematic areas on urban agriculture which included environment, health, wastewater use, composting, marketing, legal and policy issues.

Also, a regional urban agriculture policy and legislation workshop was conducted in December 2005 in order to sensitize policy makers in the region of the impediments to urban agriculture development created by the lack of clear policies and legal frameworks and local by-laws. Twenty seven (27) participants from Botswana, South Africa, Malawi, Uganda, Zambia and Zimbabwe attended the workshop. Participants highlighted the need to review legal instruments and to develop clear policies on urban agriculture.

Based on the situation analysis and policy review on urban agriculture, the local team identified a set of pilot actions and projects on urban agriculture. These include:

- ❖ The identification of peri-urban land on the edge of the city. The land is to be demarcated into 200-square-metre plots for use by households;
- ❖ The resuscitation of boreholes in the city and the use of land around them for urban agriculture.
- ❖ The development of training materials for urban farmers.
- ❖ The improved management and physical renewal of the community garden at Gum Plantation.

THE GUM PLANTATION PROJECT

The Community Garden at Gum Plantation involves 1080 poor households and four cooperatives with small plots on municipal land irrigated with treated wastewater. The organization of this community garden needed improvement and strengthening and physical renewal of the site were needed.

Training was organised to impart management skills to the farmers at Gum Plantation so that they would be able to review the current management set-up at the site and make it more responsive to their needs. The training dealt with:

- ❖ Introducing farmers to group dynamics
- ❖ Discussing how to set up functional management structures
- ❖ Equipping the farmers with tools for conflict resolution
- ❖ Reviewing the current management structures

As an outcome, farmers have reviewed the existing management structures at the plantation and came up with satisfactory and functional structures.

Next to improvement of management structures, farmers were supported in terms of technical and marketing training, improving access to water (through the establishment of bore-holes), as well as in further urban agriculture technology development.

RESULTS AND OUTCOMES

Some of the mayor results achieved in the past 3 years include:

- ❖ An institutional home for urban agriculture has been created within the Town Planning Section within the Engineering Department of the municipality. Staff has been dedicated to this activity.
- ❖ The 2000 policy has been revised and articulate clearer guidelines on the issue of irrigation and water harvesting for urban agriculture (both gardening and aquaculture). It also more prominently distinguishes and encourages “on-plot” agriculture (around the house) compared to “off-plot” agriculture, as land for this activity is already ensured. Guidelines on certain crop cultivation and livestock practices are also being more precisely defined. Earlier legislation for example prohibits planting within 30 meters of a stream, in order to protect water courses from pollution by agro-chemicals and prevent soil erosion. Recent research has shown however that some crops can protect stream banks and prevent soil erosion, and that stream-bank cultivation could be promoted under certain circumstances. The keeping

of small livestock within the city is another area where earlier legislation - which discouraged the practice - was revisited.

- ❖ Several projects on urban agriculture have been initiated (see above). A variety of actors like World Vision and Oxfam-UK have come on board to assist with funding for some of the urban agriculture projects identified in the city. Bulawayo City Council is now also using its own resources to establish demonstration community gardens in each ward. A training package was developed for both the poor and the not-so-poor urban farmers in the city. The package was developed in conjunction with the Department of Agriculture and Extension Services (AREX) in the Ministry of Agriculture and the Khami School Leavers Training Centre in Bulawayo. Action AID on its turn has taken up the issue of water provision. SNV has become involved in the marketing plan and assisting in marketing training and linking farmers to markets.

LESSONS LEARNT

- ❖ The MPAP process is a tool that is convincing to policy makers. It is not entirely new to them but the packaging that arises as a result of the application of the process makes it easy to convince them on the need to review their urban agriculture activities. The major selling point is that it is something they can also use for various other activities.
- ❖ Planning for the various training and policy awareness events has highlighted the lack of good examples on urban agriculture from the region. Besides the few cases from Cape Town, Kampala and Botswana, most of the cases available tend to portray urban agriculture in a negative picture. Efforts should be intensified to develop good case studies on successful urban agriculture projects and programmes.
- ❖ Learning from other people’s experiences is an effective way of convincing policy makers. The Policy and Legislation Seminar was successful because of the presentations of experiences from other cities both within Zimbabwe and outside. Various participants highlighted what they learned and even those which are seen as doing well, also admitted to have learned some new issues from other cities or countries’ experiences.
- ❖ The earlier 2000 policy had been largely crafted by only a small committee of city council. Central to the MPAP process was the promotion of greater dialogue on urban agriculture policy formulation and action planning. Broad-based participation of a wide array of urban agriculture stakeholders in development of the new

urban agriculture policy was crucial. Their participation has laid the basis for assisting in the organization and financing of pilot projects on the ground.

- ❖ It proved important to agree on a clear process for implementation, with the multi-stakeholder forum reporting directly to a municipal planning committee, which in turn reports to the full municipal council.

References


- Deelstra, T. D. Boyd and M. van den Biggelaar. 2006. *Multifunctional Land Use, Promoting Urban Agriculture in Europe*. In: R. van Veenhuizen. 2006. *Cities Farming for the Future: Urban Agriculture for Green and Productive Cities*, RUAF Foundation/IDRC/IIRR.
- Earl, S., F. Carden & T. Smutylo. 2001. *Outcome Mapping: Building Learning and Reflection into Development Programs*. Ottawa: International Development and Research Centre (IDRC).
- Hemmati, M. (with contributions from F. Dodds, J. Enayati and J. McHarry), 2002. *Multi-Stakeholder Processes for Governance and Sustainability: Beyond Deadlock and Conflict*. Earthscan. London, UK.
- Municipality of Villa María del Triunfo, IPES and RUAF, 2006. *Villa María-sembrando para la vida*. Lima, Peru
- Partners and Propper, 2004. *Verslag Afronding "initiatieffase" opstelling regeling burgerparticipatie gemeente Westervoort*.
- Wilbers J., and H. de Zeeuw, 2006. *A critical review of recent policy documents on urban agriculture*. In: "Urban Agriculture Magazine 16: Formulating effective policies on urban agriculture". RUAF Foundation, Leusden, the Netherlands

Acronyms and Abbreviations

AWGUPA	Accra Working Group on Urban and Peri-urban Agriculture
MoFA AMA	Ministry of Food and Agriculture and the Accra Metropolitan Assembly
CBO	Community Based Organisation
CFF	Cities Farming for the Future Programme
ETC-UA	ETC-Urban Agriculture
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
IAGU	Institut Africain de Gestion Urbaine (African Urban Management Institute, Senegal)
IPES	Instituto Peruano de Promoción del Desarrollo Sostenible (Peruvian Institute for the promotion of Sustainable Development)
IWMI	International Water Management Institute (Offices in Ghana and India)
LAC	Latin America and the Caribbean region
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MDP	Municipal Development Partnership for Eastern and Southern Africa (Zimbabwe)
MENA	Middle East and North African
MPAP	Multi-stakeholder Policy Formulation and Action Planning
MSPs	Multi-Stakeholder Processes
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
PRA	Participatory Rapid Appraisal
PTD	Participatory Technology Development
RUAF	International Network of Resource Centres on Urban Agriculture and Food Security
SGUA	Support Group on Urban Agriculture
SIUPA	Strategic Initiative on Urban and Peri-urban Agriculture (now named Urban Harvest)
ToT	Training of Trainers
UA	Urban Agriculture
UPA	Urban and Periurban Agriculture
UMP	Urban Management Programme (UN-HABITAT) (Ecuador, Kenya)
UN-HABITAT	United Nations Human Settlements Programme
WHO	World Health Organization

RUAF FOUNDATION

RESOURCE CENTRES ON URBAN AGRICULTURE & FOOD SECURITY



THE RUAF PARTNERS



Latin America

IPES Promoción del Desarrollo Sostenible, Lima Peru
email: au@ipes.org.pe www.ipes.org



French Speaking West Africa

IAGU Institut Africain de Gestion Urbaine, Dakar, Senegal
email: moussa@iagu.org www.iagu.org



English Speaking West Africa

IWMI-Ghana, International Water Management Institute
email: o.cofie@cgiar.org www.iwmi.cgiar.org/africa/west_africa



East and Southern Africa

MDP Municipal Development Partnership
email: tmubvami@mdpafrika.org.zw www.mdpafrika.org.zw



South and South East Asia

IWMI-India, International Water Management Institute
email: r.simmons@cgiar.org www.iwmi.cgiar.org/southasia/index.asp



North Africa and Middle East

AUB-ESDU, American University of Beirut, Environmental and Sustainable Development Unit email: zm13@aub.edu.lb
Magazine in Arabic: www.ecosystems.org/urbanagriculture/index.htm



China

IGSNRR Institute of Geographical Sciences and Natural Resource Research of the Chinese Academy of Sciences; email: caijm@igsnr.ac.cn www.cnruaf.com



Coordination and Strategy Development

ETC-UA ETC-Urban Agriculture
email: ruaf@etcnl.nl www.ruaf.org

Since 1999, the International network of Resource Centres on Urban Agriculture and Food Security (RUAF) supports awareness raising, documentation and exchange of information on urban agriculture. In March 2005 the RUAF partners jointly established the RUAF Foundation as their joint administrative body and liaison office. The central aim of the RUAF Foundation is to contribute to urban poverty reduction, urban food security, improved urban environmental management, empowerment of urban farmers and participatory city governance by enhancing policy awareness on benefits and risks of urban agriculture, capacity development, facilitating local policy formulation and action planning on urban agriculture, and promoting networking and exchange of experiences.

CITIES FARMING FOR THE FUTURE PROGRAMME

The Cities Farming for the Future programme (2005-2010) is the follow-up to the first phase (1999-2004) of the RUAF core programme. CFF is funded by DGIS (the Netherlands) and IDRC (Canada) and is implemented by the seven regional RUAF partners in co-ordination with ETC-UA (Leusden, the Netherlands) in 20 pilot cities and 48 dissemination cities. In the pilot cities the RUAF partners are implementing the following main strategies: Local Capacity Development, Facilitation of MPAP (Multi Stakeholder Policy Development and Action Planning), Knowledge Management and networking, Monitoring and Gender mainstreaming.

The RUAF-CFF PROGRAMME is funded by

