Making the Edible Landscape:
Participatory Planning, Design and Development of Garden Neighbourhoods

FINAL Evaluation Report

Acacia Consulting & Research
Michel Frojmovic
March 6, 2007

Submitted to:

Mark Redwood, Program Officer
Urban Poverty & Environment Program
International Development Research Centre

IDRC Project # 102440

Making the Edible Landscape
FINAL Evaluation Report

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

FINDINGS

The mid-term evaluation presented 30 recommendations structured into ten categories:

1. Strengthening the Project Results Framework
2. Organizational Behavioural Change
3. Participatory Site Design and Planning
4. Multi-stakeholder Team Approach
5. Training and Knowledge Transfer
6. Resource Expansion Strategy
7. Knowledge Management and the Project ISS
8. South-South Knowledge Transfer
9. Documenting and Disseminating Research Findings and Results
10. Coordination Team Roles and Responsibilities

The final evaluation revisits these recommendations, and presents its major findings in terms of these same ten categories. These are summarized in the following table:

Summary Table of Recommendations

#	Mid-Term Evaluation Recommendation	Progress Since July 2005
	3.1 Strengthening the Project Results Framework	
1	Using table 1 as a guide, design a project results framework, with explicit reference to project activities, outputs, outcomes, impact, reach and risk.	A project results framework was revised at the May 2005 internal workshop. While this was thought to be helpful, it is not clear that the revised logframe was fully developed or adequately used to guide project decision-making and accountability. For example, 'reach' and 'risk' are not identified.
2	Identify measurable indicators for each of the key outcomes anticipated during the life of the project, with the number of these outcomes to be scaled back.	Indicators are not defined in a way that is measurable or observable. However, a number of project documents provide examples of specific indicators of change, illustrating how this component could have been developed by the coordinating team.
3	Report on progress towards intended outcomes and impact, and report on expected versus actual outputs.	A system of regular Outcome Journals was implemented, resulting in more regular reporting of progress towards results, and early identification of risks. Regular communication was bolstered by more frequent phone calls and site visits. Willingness on the part of local teams to openly report 'risk' in this transparent and direct format was thought to be an important success.
	3.2 Organizational Behavioural Change	
4	Develop indicators for monitoring and evaluating behavioural changes in selected project partners.	More attention was given to indicator development during the second half of the project. However, indicators were not adequately developed, referring to changes in "attitude, vision, and capacity" without specifying how these changes could be observed or measured. Measurable and observable illustrations of change are provided in various project documents, however, these do not appear to have identified as targets up-front, and therefore are not explicitly laid out in the project logframe.
5	Identify those organizations most critical to achieving project results in each of the three cities.	Project team members effectively identified key organizations in each project jurisdiction. However in Colombo, two new organizational stakeholders (the departments of Public Health and Ayurvedic medicine) emerged late in the process. It is difficult to say whether earlier attention to organizational behavioural change would have resulted in the earlier identification and involvement of these key partners.

6	Rather than major changes to local business models for development, clearly define the "marginal gains" to be achieved in each city.	During the second half of the project, all team members appeared to recognize the need to identify more realistic expectations given project timing and resource limitations. An 'incremental', 'demonstration / pilot' or 'marginal gains' approach was adopted by local project teams, but it is not clear that this strategic shift was explicitly directed or managed by the coordinating team.
	3.3 Participatory Site Design and Planning	
7	Explicit reference to a participatory design-based planning process should be inserted into the Colombo Workplan.	More explicit reference to participatory community design in Colombo was initially addressed via work with local NGO Sevanatha; however, meaningful participatory UA design was not implemented to the satisfaction of the coordination team (likely due to a lack of capacity on the part of the NGO). Subsequently, uptake of participatory community design occurred more successfully through the Departments of Public Health and Ayurvedic Medicine, where practice has shifted from dispensing medicinal plants to significant community involvement and capacity-building.
8	Site design in Kampala should involve key decision-makers, rather than prospective residents.	During the second half of the project, documentation reflects attention to the need to involve key institutional decision-makers in Kampala; emphasis was placed on targeting the mayor and members of city council to ensure high level buy-in. This has proved important given current political threats to the poor-poor focus of the project.
	3.4 Multi-stakeholder Team Approach	
	No recommendations	
	3.5 Training and Knowledge Transfer	
9	The target audience for training and knowledge activities must be more carefully defined in terms of individuals or organizations whose behaviour is to be influenced by the project.	Local target organizations for behavioural change were effectively identified during the second half of the project. However, clear definition of this audience did not translate into the production of targeted knowledge transfer materials. There was significant focus on WUF outputs for an international audience. Other key audiences do not appear to be explicitly defined and linked to knowledge transfer activities. Nonetheless, important learning is captured in high-quality draft materials that could be developed beyond the life of the project.
10	Build in more face-to-face interaction between	From the perspective of the project team, involvement of local and

	international trainers and local City Teams.	international technical personnel was felt to be generally accounted-for in project activities. However, insufficient knowledge transfer was attributed to the fact that professional and technical outputs (including student contributions), and travel resources were oriented to WUF rather than to local training, capacity-building, and implementation.
11	Make available a wider diversity of disciplines, including agricultural sciences.	This was not perceived to be a key challenge (see above).
12	Where demand warrants, international design experts should be inserted into the local participatory design process.	Further involvement of international design experts was not perceived to be necessary. However, the local participatory design process was thought to need strengthening in general vis a vis WUF related outputs (see above).
13	Remaining student-related project outputs should be carefully reviewed to determine their contribution to core project results.	Student outputs were focused on production of WUF materials including the pavilion and panel formats. This was thought to be very successful in terms of a high-quality presence at the WUF. However, this occurred at the cost of using student resources to strengthen local design processes, potentially resulting in missed opportunities for student learning and academic research in the area of participatory local UA design.
14	Consider the production of a participatory design handbook with a UA focus.	High quality draft materials were produced. However, emphasis on production of WUF materials prevented published versions of these being completed during the life of the project.
15	Make available to City Teams relevant hard copy publications and print media from Canada and international sources.	Effective distribution of relevant material by traditional means was undertaken by the coordinating team; lack of access to such publications was not seen to be a significant barrier. However, suggestions that this function could be strengthened via use of a website, bulletin board, or blog did not appear to be implemented.
	3.6 Resource Expansion (RX) Strategy	
16	Project implementation should be shifted to a long-term project impact, rather than an outcome to be achieved during the life of the project.	Expected implementation results were scaled back to be more in-line with project resources and timing. However, it was not clear whether this was strategically managed by the coordinating team, or explicitly outlined in the project logframe.
17	Formally shift the role of the Coordination Team from RX leader to RX enabler.	IDRC assumed more responsibility for the project RX strategy, hiring consultants who would assist with identification of potential implementation partners. This was thought to be helpful in terms of freeing up the coordinating team to focus on implementation. However, the activities of the

		consultants were thought to be insufficiently integrated with local project activities and associated RX activities.
18	Identify a local "developer" in each city who champions the project and is able to take on multiple dimensions of project implementation.	This recommendation was not explicitly implemented. However, members of the coordinating team suggest that there was a need for more capacity building of local teams with respect to RX. A number of potential RX opportunities were not able to be sufficiently developed and/or leveraged.
19	Revisit the role of the Advisory Board and consider its dissolution.	This entity never materialized, and there is not clear consensus as to the perceived usefulness of such a structure. However, some members of the coordinating team suggested that some form of senior advisory input would have been helpful in several areas, particularly in the area of RX capacity-building and RX 'connectors'.
	3.7 Knowledge Management and the Project ISS	
20	Scale down the level of investment in the ISS to more closely reflect the planned outputs identified at the proposal stage.	This was accomplished.
21	Make better use of medium-tech solutions such as the mcgill.ca/mchg website and CDs/DVDs couriered between Montreal and the three partner cities.	Communication effectively settled into more conventional means. However, preparation of WUF materials was undertaken online which speaks to the potential usefulness of hi-tech mediums if used in conjunction with other effective forms of project management, communication, and coordination. It is not clear to what extent use of a project website was maximized.
22	Make available broader and simpler information-sharing guidelines and protocols.	Information-sharing occurred more smoothly during the second half of the project via the use of regular Outcome Journals, and other more conventional means. In particular, the use of protocols and guides used to facilitate production of WUF materials was thought to be a replicable tool.
	3.8 South-South Knowledge Transfer	
23	The Project Coordination Team's role should be to collect, process, synthesize, translate and disseminate information that is of interest to the different teams.	The coordination team effectively took a more active role in sharing information among local teams (see above).
24	Consider using the WUF as a forum for face-to-face interaction among team members.	This was done and was helpful. However, it did not necessarily result in increased South-South interaction during the remainder of the project.
	3.9 Documenting and Disseminating research	

	findings and results	
25	More explicit emphasis is needed on the preparation of local marketing and promotional materials to be used to secure support for project implementation within each city.	Efforts in this area include the production of a video by the Rosario team as well as production of leaflets in Colombo and Kampala, and a booklet in Colombo. However, it is not clear whether these activities were adequately emphasized and linked with implementation strategies.
26	Urgent action is needed to fully engage the three City Teams in a joint proposal for participation in the WUF.	This was implemented very successfully, but to the detriment of other project activities. Resourcing arrangements related to event preparation will need to be revisited for similar undertakings in the future.
27	Consider using the WUF to present earlier and ongoing UA projects in each of the three cities.	This was implemented successfully (see above). A number of project documents offer useful evaluation of project sessions and pavilion content that could inform future dissemination and promotion efforts.
28	Guidelines and protocols for relying on multi-media technologies should be simplified and allowed to be tailored to local circumstances.	This was effectively addressed during the second half of the project (see above).
29	Non-WUF outputs related to international networking and publishing should be excluded from the core project results framework.	This recommendation was met through a clear focus on WUF-outputs. Nonetheless, project team members also participated at the 74th ACFAS conference, which was thought to be an important deliverable in terms of contribution to scholarly forums.
	3.10 Coordination Team Roles and Responsibilities	
30	Consider several modifications to the terms of reference for members of the Project Coordination Team.	A number of modifications were made (eg. shift in efforts allocated to the ISS and the RX strategy). These were thought to be helpful. However, it was also felt that sufficient resources had not been allocated to project coordination, administrative, reporting and accounting functions. In general coordination team members reported feeling there was too much 'remote control', and that a more active, structured, face-to-face and 'hands on' approach to coordination would have been helpful.

METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

As with the mid-term evaluation, the final evaluation was undertaken using a combination of a review of available project documentation and structured interviews with key project coordination team members. Feedback was also received from IDRC.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The final section presents the following conclusions and recommendations:

- The Overall Conclusion: All roads lead back to the need for a clear, concise, and measurable project results framework.

- The EL project enjoyed limited effectiveness in knowledge transfer via locally relevant knowledge products and South-South communication.

- A clear and unexpected MCHG value-added was in the areas of technological innovation and policy promotion.
    - advancing innovation in knowledge management
    - strategically promoting a policy message to a global audience

- Two additional MCHG assets could be better leveraged in the future: student input and participatory site design talent.

- The project would have benefited from a formalized recruitment process and clearer mandate for the Canadian Project Manager.

- The project was disadvantaged by a blurring of responsibilities involving project management and technological innovation.

- A "lighter touch" and decentralized approach to project management would be beneficial in a multi-city project.

- The project would have benefited from IDRC/UPE providing clear guidance on intended results.

- The RX Function should be dropped. IDRC/UPE should do what it does best: designing and managing high-quality research and research capacity building projects with carefully selected partners around the world.

- IDRC/UPE should review any lessons learned from the perception of competition for scarce resources between local EL projects and Focus City projects.

- With results frameworks clearly defined, IDRC/UPE could rely on in-house evaluation & monitoring.

- In light of the possible launch of a new global secretariat for UA promotion, IDRC and McGill should review the lessons learned from the previous experience with the Support Group for Urban Agriculture (SGUA).

1. STUDY BACKGROUND

Making the Edible Landscape was launched at the 2004 World Urban Forum in Barcelona, Spain. The three-year collaborative project was intended to demonstrate the value of including urban agriculture as a permanent feature in city planning and housing design. With support from the International Development Research Centre (IDRC), the research project was coordinated by the Minimum Cost Housing Group (MCHG) of McGill University and ETC Netherlands. Research was undertaken in three cities: Colombo, Sri Lanka; Kampala, Uganda; and Rosario, Argentina.

The primary objective of the project was to develop, with local teams in Canada and in the three southern cities, capacities and expertise to design, implement, validate and disseminate design proposals which integrate agricultural functions into the development or upgrading of low-income residential districts in selected developing-country city settings.

In each of the sites, city officials, architects, and urban planners were to form collaborative teams, working closely with local communities. Researchers were to test housing designs that included food-producing gardens to demonstrate the potential of urban agriculture. Sites were chosen by a competitive process to reflect global biodiversity as well as different ways of combining living, working, and growing food within the city.

The results of *Making the Edible Landscape* were showcased at the 2006 World Urban Forum held in Vancouver, Canada.

Acacia Consulting & Research (ACR) was contracted by the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) in May 2005 to conduct an external evaluation of the Making the Edible Landscape (EL) Project.

The goal of the external evaluation is to strengthen the research project, by,
- analyzing the relevance of the project's research themes;
- analyzing the adequacy of project management and methodology; and,
- providing recommendations that will feed into project activities.

A mid-term evaluation report was submitted in July 2005, highlighting project strengths and weaknesses and offering suggestions for changes to project activities. The recommendations outlined in the mid-term evaluation report were meant to elicit reaction and discussion by IDRC and the Project Coordination Team, and to serve as guidelines for possible change over the coming months.

The primary audience for the final evaluation report is IDRC. This report provides an update on changes made to the project since the mid-term evaluation, and provides an analysis of MCHG's capacity to undertake similar projects in the future.

2. METHODOLOGY

The following tasks were undertaken in order to complete the Final Evaluation Report:

- Review the EL team's response to the Mid-Term Evaluation Report;
- Review the IDRC Program Officer's subsequent comments on the EL team's response to the mid-term evaluation;
- Review any other project documentation prepared since August 2005, including trip reports, the revised EL project "logframe", progress reports, and other available project deliverables;
- Review the EL Tool and Website;
- Conduct follow-up interviews with EL team members during the 2006 WUF, to assess general progress against key Mid-Term Evaluation Report recommendations;
- Attend WUF sessions dealing with the project:
- Prepare interview schedules based on areas of achievement and of concern since the submission of the mid-term evaluation report (see Annex);
- Undertake post-WUF follow-up telephone interviews with core EL team members; and,
- Incorporate feedback from IDRC/UPE.

The mid-term evaluation report was submitted in July 2005. Preparation of the mid-term evaluation report was based on the following steps:
- Meetings with IDRC
- Review of relevant project documents
- Review of selected project email correspondence
- First-hand observation at McGill Workshop (May 17-23)
- Interviews and discussions with team members during the McGill Workshop
- Field interview with Rosario City Team Members – July 15[1]
- Telephone interview with Jeanne Wolfe re: Kampala

---

[1] An ACR associate was in Argentina on personal travel at the time of the study.

3. FINDINGS

The final evaluation of the Edible Landscape Project was structured around the recommendations that emerged during the mid term project evaluation in July 2005. Thus, findings from the final evaluation are presented in terms of the ten recommendation theme areas identified at the mid-term stage. In large part, this section is a report of feedback received from team members, rather than the consultant's commentary of the project. The concluding section represents the consultant's analysis.

3.1 Strengthening the Project Results Framework

The key difficulty in assessing the project's results framework is the limited amount of project reporting delivered since the mid-term evaluation. Reports received by the evaluator were informal and limited in detail. Consistent reporting templates (including labeling with data and author) were not evident, making documentation largely unsuitable for external audiences.

The project results framework and project team terms of reference were modified during the project's May 2005 Internal Workshop. This was generally regarded by IDRC and McGill as a favourable undertaking. The mid-term evaluation report provided additional detailed direction regarding the redesign and streamlining of a project logframe. The project coordinator expects that the final project report will use the revised logframe as a benchmark, and that the framework will be relevant to the outcomes being reported.

However, it is not clear whether the project logframe was used to its maximum potential, or whether it was used to guide project activities throughout the duration of the project. A relevant logframe and associated indicators could have been used to provide more specific guidelines and regular checks between the coordinating and local teams. Instead, the project adopted an approach of practical experimentation that was translated back to the logframe after-the-fact. Following the project mid-term evaluation, a system of Outcome Journal reporting was implemented; this appears to have been helpful in terms of providing results-based feedback to the project coordinator. However, it is not clear whether the journal entries were explicitly linked to the project logframe. Without having reviewed project Outcome Journals or an updated logframe, it is difficult to know if regular reporting was structured to enable assessment of expected versus actual outputs, and progress towards intended outcomes and impact.

A detailed evaluation of the logframe itself is outside the scope of this report. However a preliminary scan suggests the revised logframe is underdeveloped or at least poorly documented. Specific indicators are not always described, and the logframe is not consistent across documents[2]. Most importantly, the shortcomings in the logframe are reflected in project outcomes. Members of the project coordination team cited significant variation between planned and actual project activities. Most notable was the disproportionate amount of time and resources expended on both WUF- and ISS-related outputs in comparison to local on-the-ground implementation. In addition, insufficient attention to identifying 'risks' early on in the project led to unforeseen challenges in some sites, such as institutional barriers in Colombo. Arguably, more explicit attention to risk identification within the project logframe may have cued the coordinating team to identify and mitigate these obstacles at an earlier point. Project coordination team members

---

[2] Ie. 'Revised EL project logframe' and the 'Interim Technical Report Nov 06'

report that attention to risk identification in Outcome Journals during the second half of the project was helpful.

While insufficient attention was paid to indicator development within the project logframe, a number of project documents provide examples of specific and measurable change, illustrating how indicators could have been developed with more attention on the part of the coordinating team. For example, the following evidence was identified based on June 2006 interviews with project team members:

- 25 families moved in with agricultural activity in Kampala
- 50 families actively involved with agriculture in Colombo
- A productive plaza functioning in Rosario, meaning a full crop is in place

Despite criticisms of the project results framework, it is clear that the project has achieved a number of significant and planned results in each jurisdiction.

In Rosario, the following significant results were cited:
- The Public Housing department has proposed integrating UA into projects without additional funding; this reflects buy-in of local urban planners and designers;
- Housing and Neighbourhood Planning departments now work together more closely; integration of UA principles have been institutionalized in the city's administrative master plan and infrastructure plan (including highway design, and planning of open spaces). This indicates the City is institutionalizing UA beyond a food security focus;
- University administration (eg Dean) has organized UA seminars and exhibitions, and has begun plans to integrate UA into its academic curricula;
- There is an explicit focus on integration of UA into economic systems, including set-up of legislative structures (eg. 'organic' certification), physical market infrastructure (benches, canopies, spinners to dry produce, air-conditioned storage), a shift from less effective systems of common ownership to more private ownership drawing on shared infrastructure, and implementation of capacity-building programs (eg. training in washing and display of wares, and preparation of jellies, jams, and preserves); and,
- A noticeable change in attitude among community members is evident, visible through significantly increased participation of beneficiaries.

In Colombo, the following significant results were cited:
- The Department of Indigenous Medicine has expanded its work from passive dispensing of medicinal plants to active work with community members to provide training on cultivation of these plants and specifically, how to undertake growing in confined spaces. This work has been recognized within the municipality, and has now received national attention, resulting in additional implementation resources;
- The Department of Indigenous Medicine has begun work on monitoring the health impacts of the indigenous medicinal plant program;
- The Minister (of Health) has asked the Department of Indigenous Medicine to investigate the possibility of scaling up this approach for use in other cities; and,
- The local NGO, Sevanatha, has displayed a new awareness and openness to integrating UA into their upgrading work. While the integration of UA is not yet institutionalized within the organization's work, it is searching for ways to do this.

In Kampala, the following significant results were cited:
- The project has advanced the implementation of existing bylaws that legalize UA and also aquaculture, and land has been allotted to beneficiaries;
- Awareness of UA was advanced for actors at all levels: community, local and national government. This includes the newly elected mayor and city council;
- The local government has institutionalized use of UA in that there is now a department dedicated specifically to UA;
- Integration of UA is being scaled up to other neighbourhoods via the Focus City (FC) project; and,
- The University Department of Architecture is now participating for the first time; 12 architecture students have been involved in a design practicum. Thus, there is indication of UA concepts becoming mainstreamed within design activities.

Montreal was added as a fourth project city. In Montreal, the following significant results were cited:
- Increased municipal government and attention to UA including productive housing, decontamination, revitalization, architecture, and the existing network of community gardens.

These impacts are particularly significant in light of a number of challenging circumstances encountered by the project, particularly in Colombo and in Kampala. In both Colombo and Kampala, tumultuous changes in local political leadership resulted in delays and a frequent need to re-establish political buy-in. The 2004 Indian Ocean Tsunami resulted in significant staff turnover and loss of capacity for the local NGO partner in Colombo, and allegations of corruption among bureaucrats in Kampala created political delays. Among other contextual circumstances, both of these factors produced significant unforeseen challenges for these particular local sites.

3.2 Organizational Behavioural Change

Behavioural change on the part of local organizations was clearly a key factor affecting the success of this project. This is reflected in key results listed above. Following the mid-term evaluation, a focus on identifying critical target organizations in each city was apparent. Project documentation reflects emphasis on the following key players:

In Rosario:
- Municipal Public Housing & Social Promotion
- The University

In Colombo:
- Local NGO Sevanatha
- Colombo Municipal Council
- Ayurvedic Department / Department of Indigenous Medicine
- Department of Public Health
- Regional (federal) office of Agriculture

In Kampala:
- City Council and Staff (Social Development & Community Welfare)

In Montreal:

- City of Montreal

The revised project logframe reflects this refocusing of attention on key organizations and indicators of organizational change. However, indicators of this change appear to be insufficiently developed. The logframe makes reference to 'measurable change in attitude, vision, and capacity…' in a number of areas, but could have benefited from clearer definition in terms of what these 'measurable changes' should be. For example, participation in WUF presentations by Kampala's new mayor could be considered a measurable and observable indicator of project support on the part of the Kampala City Council. This level of detail would have provided clearer guidance to local project teams, and would have enabled demonstration of 'marginal gains' made towards project results.

Adoption of a 'marginal gains' approach appears to have occurred within each jurisdiction, based on local teams' awareness of the need to scale-back project outcomes to be more realistic in light of political realities, project timeframe, and available resources. Team members were unanimous in their agreement that project goals (to move from design, to policy development, to implementation within a 3 year time frame) were not realistic. In this regard, building plans in Kampala shifted to incorporate an 'incremental' approach, allowing planting to occur prior to building, and building to occur in stages. In Colombo the project scaled back objectives to focus on accomplishing 'demonstration' houses and lots. However, this shift to 'marginal gains' appeared to occur on an 'ad hoc' basis in each location rather than being explicitly guided by the coordinating team.

Identification of key organizations and project champions within each city appeared to be extremely helpful, with project team members suggesting that this could and should have occurred earlier in the project. In Colombo, for instance, a key institutional champion in the Chief Medical Officer of Ayurvedic Medicine emerged at a late point in the project. Project documentation reflects the sense that this key organization could have been identified earlier with improved planning. Explicit incorporation of reach, risk identification, and indicator development relating to organizational change within the project logframe and regular reporting structures may have had a significant benefit in this regard.

3.3 Participatory Site Design and Planning

Participatory site design and planning occurred to various extents in each of the project sites. Willingness on the part of local planners and architects to incorporate community design marks a significant accomplishment for the project.

In Colombo, the question of more explicit reference to participatory community design was addressed in two ways. Having identified the local NGO (Sevanatha) as a key target of organizational change, project coordinators and the Colombo team worked with NGO project staff to encourage meaningful community participation in the upgrading process. This was considered successful to some extent; in Halgaha Kumbura, Sevanatha undertook to mobilize residents in a process of lane-by-way upgrading, with high levels of community participation reported. However, UA concepts were not adequately integrated into these activities and Halgaha Kumbura is only one of several projects in the jurisdiction. In addition, the project coordinating team encouraged the reinstatement of Community Development Committees (CDCs) as a vehicle through which to enhance

community engagement. However, inadequate care and preparation was devoted to this attempt, and functional CDCs did not materialize.

Uptake of participatory community design in Colombo appears to have occurred most successfully through the involvement of the Chief Medical Officer of Health / Department of Public Health and the department of Ayurvedic Medicine. Within these two entities, practice has shifted from merely dispensing of traditional medicinal plants, to significant community involvement and capacity-building with respect to confined-space growing and use of the plants. However, involvement of these groups occurred near the end of the project and knowledge transfer and implementation with respect to these activities is thought to be beyond the scope of the project.

In Kampala, emphasis on participatory design has been strong throughout the life of the project. This was demonstrated at the mid-point in the project when design proposals underwent a "180 degree" shift; based on community feedback, the new designs attempted to better accommodate the needs of beneficiaries by adopting a more incremental approach to building and using less expensive locally available materials. During the second half of the project, documentation reflects attention to the need to involve key institutional decision-makers in Kampala; emphasis was placed on targeting the mayor and members of city council to ensure high level buy-in. This has proved extremely important given current political threats which would see the site marketed to the higher income end of the housing market, rather than the intended low income beneficiaries. In the face of this challenge, attention to community participation has resulted in strong support and buy-in from local stakeholders; they are proud and committed, even having made t-shirts

3.4 Multi-stakeholder Team Approach

The project's multi-stakeholder approach is generally thought by team members to have been a favourable aspect of project design. However, several challenges faced by these diverse local teams were thought to have had an impact on project results. In many jurisdictions, multi-stakeholder teams were comprised of organizations and personnel that did not previously have a close working relationship. Further, local teams had varying degrees of experience in working with international development projects, and varying degrees of commitment to pro-poor project objectives. The formation in Kampala of a project-specific administrative unit within the local government was thought to be important in sustaining momentum throughout the life of the project. In other jurisdictions, local project teams faced difficulties in establishing administrative and communications mechanisms, and in prioritizing project activities in the face of numerous other demands on time and resources. It was suggested that the principle of multiple stakeholders was excellent, but that these local teams would have benefited from more technical and methodological support from the coordinating team. Local teams should have been assessed and supported in terms of knowledge of UA, clear articulation of project objectives, multi-stakeholder processes, and community buy-in.

With respect to the structure and activities of local teams, project coordinators were unanimous in identifying the presence of urban planning interns in Kampala and later, in Colombo, as extremely helpful. In Kampala, a carefully-planned approach to integration of UA was evident in WUF materials, reflecting, among other factors, the work of interns present in that site throughout the process. Although opinions differed regarding just how necessary or integral to project success these young professionals were, all team

members felt the presence of interns had assisted structuring and documenting local activities, and ensuring momentum. Interns were felt to have been valuable in smoothing and maintaining communication between the local and coordinating teams. particularly with respect to identifying problems that may not otherwise be openly stated. Some coordination team members felt the presence of an intern or young professional was a key model to be pursued in future projects.

3.5 Training and Knowledge Transfer

In each city, the process of community design undertaken by the project was a first-time experiment made more significant by advancing principles of urban design. Hence, the project resulted in a number of valuable lessons learned regarding multi-functional / mixed-use design, use of confined space, and development of new settlements.

Despite the potential for significant knowledge transfer, this project result was thought to have been largely sacrificed in order to achieve WUF-related outputs.

From the perspective of the project team, involvement of technical personnel was generally accounted for in project activities.[3] In addition, the availability of technical advice via Canadian and international print media, and via international trainers was not perceived as a barrier. Rather, insufficient knowledge transfer was attributed to the fact that professional and technical outputs -including student contributions- and travel resources were oriented to WUF rather than to local training, capacity-building, and implementation. Further, effective training and knowledge transfer activities would have varied significantly for the various audiences. More careful attention to definition of target audiences and monitoring of corresponding activities via the project logframe may have enabled an improved balance with respect to the trade-off between WUF and site-specific outputs

Members of the coordination team suggested that there were several missed opportunities with respect to further training of local stakeholders. These included having to forgo planned or desired technical / training visits to local sites, and failure to adequately develop knowledge transfer products. In particular, one team member suggested that two products would have been key:

1. A Methodology Guide: providing a detailed overview of the community design process, including workshop curricula, associated time and resource requirements, how to involve professional architects and planners. An important aspect would be illustrations – community drawings and corresponding architectural designs.

---

[3] In Rosario, the city team received training on participatory design from a regionally know expert (Marie Enet). As well, the Rosario team brought in design experts from Central America. In Kampala, beyond visits by the McGill team, two Dutch experts (in sustainable architecture and sustainable urban development) spent five days at the local site to support the participatory design workshop. Interns and students provided design expertise – particularly in Kampala. Furthermore, participation of the local teams in the 2005 Montreal workshop allowed them to interface with McGill international staff and professionals from other cities. IDRC provided the Kampala team with advice on several items including housing design (use of low-cost, locally available materials, and specific advice regarding sewage), and design of effective presentations. The input of ETC also brought technical support in agronomic and permaculture techniques. Good local agronomists worked with city teams, as demonstrated by the planting guidelines prepared by the Colombo Aryuvedic Department.

2. Technical toolkits: providing detailed, illustrated technical resources on different kinds of growing, for example:
   - A guide to growing and use of various types of medicinal plants (Colombo)
   - Guidelines and conditions for construction of productive housing, including requirements for safe & effective rooftop growing (Kampala).
   - Guidelines for modification or upgrading of existing built environments to incorporate opportunities for UA, including confined space growing (Colombo).
   - Guidelines for implementation of a garden park and multi-functional public square (Rosario)
   - Guidelines for design of productive neighbourhoods, including high-quality designs and models that could be used in school curricula and to educate architects and planners.
   - Guidelines and tools related to building on marginal sites, such as those that have been damaged through bombing, or where there is little or no access to services or water.
   - Specific instructions for building UA tools such as a growing tower or fencing.

One relevant question is whether or not improved planning could have seen WUF materials designed to enable their post-WUF transformation into dissemination materials (eg. toolkits and methodology guides). While the project's WUF pavilion was considered an excellent vehicle for showcasing the project to an international audience, the pavilion could not be used to transfer knowledge or implement community-based UA design amongst local stakeholders in project sites.

Although training activities and knowledge transfer materials were not adequately developed during the life of the project, project documentation does include preliminary publications and draft materials that could be developed to achieve knowledge transfer outcomes. This includes a good draft document on the process of community design that occurred in Kampala, methodology notes originating from Rosario, as well as a project video. Thus, potential exists for a number of effective knowledge transfer products to be developed beyond the life of the project. However, it is unclear how this would occur beyond the life of the project.

3.6 Resource Expansion Strategy

The project's Resource Expansion (RX) strategy was thought by project team members to have had positive potential. However, a number of factors limited the effectiveness of this project component. In the early stages of the project, the coordinating team devoted a significant amount of time, unsuccessfully, towards internship funding. As noted during the mid-term evaluation, planned implementation results were out of scale in comparison with project resources, leading to inflated expectations on the part of local partners.

During the second half of the project, implementation outcomes were re-evaluated to reflect the in-kind commitments of land, staff and municipal resources committed by local partners. For instance, planned results were refocused to include 'demonstration' and 'prototyping' rather than attempting to achieve 'full-scale' implementation during the life of the project. WUF was seen as an important forum for securing interest and commitment on the part of potential local implementation partners. However, the extent to which the project's success at WUF can be linked to new implementation resources is not known.

At the project's mid-term point, responsibility for the RX strategy was largely assumed by IDRC; in part, this involved hiring two RX consultants to identify opportunities for local implementation partnerships. This strategy was thought to be good in principle, freeing up the coordinating team to focus on knowledge management and implementation. In practice, however, team members found that the use of RX consultants was generally thought to be ineffective and ill-timed. First, consultant activities were undertaken at a relatively early point with respect to implementation. Because designs were not yet finalized, it was difficult for RX Consultant efforts to predict and adequately address implementation needs. Second, the coordinating team and local teams reported a lack of integration between project activities and the activities of consultants. In some cases, it was thought that consultants worked with a particular local partner without involving the rest of the multi-stakeholder local team, or coordination team. There was little opportunity for complimentary efforts, and it was unclear exactly how and by whom consultant activities should be followed-up.

Where potential funding sources were identified, the project team was not provided with adequate support in project formulation and negotiation. Despite being provided with a good shopping list of potential partners, the team had little capacity to pursue and access these funds. Local team members would have required support in areas such as proposal writing and techniques for approaching potential donors.

Two additional areas identified by the mid-term evaluation were raised by project team members: A project Advisory Board, and Local Project Developers. Although the maintenance of a formal Advisory Board may have been difficult for this small-scale project, this is one area where the project could have drawn more effectively on the networks and skills possessed by informal high-level / senior Project Advisors. With respect to local project developers, while project team members carried out a number of RX activities including positive meetings with several potential partners, the formal identification of a 'local project developer' in each city did not occur.

A significant factor affecting the project's RX strategy was the emergence of IDRC's Focus City project during the life of the Edible Landscape project. Once again, the principle that the FC project would continue and build on the work of the smaller EL project was thought by project coordination team members to be good. However, members of the project coordination team indicated that FC proposal preparation and start-up shifted time and interest of key project personnel away from the EL project. Delays in EL project reporting were seen to be directly attributable to staff transfers to the FC project. Similarly, municipal project partners in Colombo reported disinterest in continuing with EL project objectives in light of their acceptance as a Focus City. Project coordinators reported the FC project as a significant 'missed opportunity'. In hindsight, members of the coordinating team suggest they should have played a key role in FC applications, ensuring a logical build-up in terms of project complimentarity.

Clearly, there was an incentive for local EL project teams to submit proposals for the FC project. However, from the perspective of IDRC/UPE, the preparation of Focus City proposals was a shared responsibility between IDRC, the EL Coordinating team, and local project partners. In particular, local project partners were under no obligation to submit proposals for FC projects. Having committed to submit a proposal for the FC project, the EL teams also assumed an important responsibility to continue to manage their time accordingly.

3.7 Knowledge Management and the Project ISS

The project mid-term evaluation outlined a number of difficulties associated with the project's Information Sharing System (ISS), and recommended that medium-tech methods of knowledge management be adopted. During the second half of the project, difficulties relating to this issue were reported to be resolved, with communication settling into more traditional means, including packages sent by mail or courier, email, and in-person site visits. A schedule of regular conference calls and phone calls was established, and regular completion of Outcome Journals by project teams assisted in tracking progress towards results, and early identification of risks. Face-to-face meetings and phone calls were cited as pivotal to project success.

The project coordination team was in general agreement that initial attempts to implement the Project ISS were overly taxing, and that a change in course was indeed needed. Insufficient technical infrastructure and language difficulties were seen as having made the tool cumbersome and impractical. However, there was some sense on the part of project team members that the ISS made a valuable contribution, and that some of the difficulties were symptomatic of other project management issues which were resolved during the second half of the project. Indeed, production of all of the high quality materials prepared in preparation for the WUF was accomplished online, indicating that high-tech tools can be successfully implemented given the right supports, guidelines, motivation and context. Coordination team members specifically noted the significance and quality of student contributions in this area.

What is clear is that any attempt at a similar knowledge sharing tool should not be undertaken without careful prior investigation of technical and infrastructure-related capacities of local teams and sites. The lesson learned is the need to rethink the role of information sharing and archiving technology, including accountability around the allocation of funds for hardware to partners. In several cases, money intended for this technology was reallocated by partners for non-technology uses. In addition, there is a need to find the right "techie" type people to run and champion the use of the technology.

Equally important, is the involvement of local partners in the design of such a tool up-front, rather than attempting to 'surprise' them with a 'top down' technological solution, as was described by one project participant.

3.8 South-South Knowledge Transfer

Project teams were brought together during the May 2005 internal workshop, and again at the WUF in June 2006. This was thought to be helpful in facilitating a sense of cooperation among team members from the three cities. However, knowledge transfer and sharing between local project sites occurred to a lesser degree than originally hoped; instead, transfer of knowledge occurred primarily via the coordinating team. This was due, in part, to infrastructure and language-related barriers. However, it was also suggested that expectations in this area were unrealistic in that knowledge exchange is rarely 'spontaneous'. Especially given the lack of uptake of the ISS tool, more extensive and ongoing South-South knowledge transfer would have required more active facilitation on the part of the coordinating team. That is, sharing across jurisdictions must be facilitated by administrative practices or through joint production of a product, as in the case of materials produced for the WUF. Hence, the protocols used to facilitate

South-South transfer in the production of these WUF-related tools are themselves replicable tools that should be counted among project results.

3.9 Documenting and Disseminating Research Findings and Results

During the second half of the project, documentation and dissemination focused almost entirely on WUF. Mid-term recommendations suggesting the engagement of city teams and a focus on WUF as the key forum for international networking and publishing were addressed.

Coordination team members and project documents convey that the project's presence at WUF was highly successful. WUF is thought to have been a key lever for advancement of UA on the world stage; there are indications that the value of UA is for the first time being recognized and accepted by UN Habitat. The project's 'green' pavilion was arguably the best on the premises, and the project presence included presentations, a film, and the attendance of key local partners including City mayors. Local team collaboration to produce print and multi-media materials was thought to be extremely successful, producing high-quality results. The project was profiled during the UN Habitat "JAM" leading up to the forum, and enjoyed significant media coverage including articles in both city and national newspapers, and radio interviews. In Canada, a significant annual award offered by the Canadian Centre for Architecture was recently offered in the area of Urban Agriculture in Canadian cities.

Project coordinators felt that the EL project could take at least partial credit for these successes, and for other areas of urban design in which UA is gaining recognition. A number of project documents offer useful evaluation of project WUF networking sessions and pavilion content which could inform future dissemination and promotion efforts.[4]

Nonetheless, coordination team members were in agreement that the project's considerable efforts around WUF posed difficulties in a number of areas. The project coordinator reports significantly underestimating the resource implications associated with WUF outputs. WUF activities were not adequately reflected in project budgeting, and the substantial expenditures associated with production of event materials and securing travel arrangements for local partners resulted in massive up-front out-of-pocket expenditures for coordination team members which produced accounting complications. This last point may suggest a need to revisit future project funding / cash-flow arrangements with respect to events of this nature. In effect, the project's considerable success at the WUF appears to have been made possible through significant in-kind contributions by the coordinating team, students, McGill University, and Canadian partners such as VIA rail and the City of Vancouver. While this indicates an impressive collaborative effort on the part of all contributors, it also served to 'drain the well' – as one team member described it - in terms of in-kind project support. As a result, there was a sense of not being able to 'call in any more favours' from personal or project networks. Hence, the overall WUF effort cannot be considered sustainable or replicable, in that it was significantly out-of-scale with respect to available project resources.

Overall, the demand on project resources associated with WUF outputs was seen to have significantly decreased efforts towards on-the-ground implementation in the three

---

[4] An overview of McGill's participation at the 2006 WUF is included as an annex to this report.

project cities. This included limitations on the production of local marketing and promotional materials. In addition, coordinating team members expressed concern that local institutional project partners (particularly in Colombo) came to view WUF as the project's singular goal. In some cases, participants lost interest and commitment to local implementation once they had been assured a 'seat on the plane' to Vancouver. In this vein, plans for community members to be included among WUF attendees were for the most part unrealized, aside from one community member from Kampala. It is worthwhile to reflect on the implications of these local dynamics, and to what extent they could have been managed or avoided.

To its credit, project coordinators also note that a successful WUF presence had the effect of increasing local buy-in and momentum. This was thought to have resulted from the production of a video that could later be used for local promotion, and also via inspiring hope and credibility in the eyes of key local decision-makers present at the event. The involvement of these key decision-makers in presentations and networking sessions was thought to have made a positive impact on the project's presence at WUF.

Coordination team members differ in opinion regarding the value and overall effect of the trade-off between WUF outputs and local implementation. For instance, one team member suggested that the significant WUF travel expenditures may have been better allocated to bringing local implementation teams together for training / technical capacity building. Evaluation of such a decision is difficult without the benefit of more information regarding longer-term impacts. However, what is clear is that this trade-off appears to have been largely unplanned.

In the area of research, coordination team members characterized the project as action-research and were optimistic about dissemination of project research results. Participation at the 74th ACFAS (Association canadienne-française pour l'avancement des sciences) conference in the period leading up to the WUF was thought to be successful and important in terms of participation in scholarly forums. Research products are expected to be further developed after the life of the project, enabling longer-term results to be incorporated.

A number of key issues were identified as significant research questions, including the comparative analysis of upgrading challenges in Rosario and Colombo. This has particular significance given that slum upgrading is the only Millennium Development Goal (MDG) which has experienced a reversal of progress, making this an extremely 'hot topic'. The EL project could add value in offering baseline data and upgrading strategies associated with practical challenges and mapping. Further, the 'action' focus of the project has resulted in some unexpected findings. Flowing from the research momentum of the EL project, project coordination team members have submitted a proposal to create a UA knowledge cluster in conjunction with a number of academic and city partners.

One of the project's dissemination tools was its website. The project's web presence centres on the Mcgill.ca/mchg website, which profiles basic information, media coverage, and various early student publications up to the point of the WUF. However, there is a lack of documentation on the site, especially with respect to knowledge transfer and promotional materials. The site does not appear to have been used to exchange materials among local project teams, despite an early suggestion that this

may have been helpful. In addition, WUF materials and documentation are not currently showcased on this platform.

3.10 Coordination Team Roles and Responsibilities

Changes to the terms of reference of the coordinating team were made during the project's May 2005 internal workshop. Overall, these were reported to have been helpful. However, a number of project coordination challenges persisted. In addition, shifting of RX tasks from the project coordinator to IDRC contributed to a breakdown in integration between RX and other project activities.

A number of other challenges were associated with the geographic diversity of project sites. The selection of project sites that literally spanned the globe was thought to make a powerful conceptual impact, and to be useful in terms of comparison. However, logistical realities of these diverse sites included differences in language, socio-political context, timing, and agricultural growing seasons which were difficult to overcome given a short project cycle and limited resources. In fact, the original project was designed to include a total of four Focus Cities. This number was reduced to three on the advice of IDRC, and, in retrospect, could have been either reduced further, or been more regionally-concentrated.

One of the key strengths of the project coordination team related to its affiliation with McGill University, particularly with respect to its capacity to leverage student input. Student contributions were instrumental in a number of areas including the preparation of project documentation at several points and, specifically, high quality WUF pavilion materials. A possible long-term impact of student participation in project activities is the possibility that student interest and involvement in Urban Agriculture will carry over into their professional work. On the negative side, one limitation of relying on students was the problem of high turnover, as student involvement was generally limited to coursework or short-term projects.

During the second half of the project, the coordination team had planned to use student outputs for support to specific local design challenges such as a productive streets prototype (Rosario), a medicinal plant starter-kit for household pharmacy vertical growing (Colombo), and incorporation of student work with perma-culture principles to provide additional studies of integrated UA and housing. However, it is not clear if these plans materialized. It was suggested that, in the end, student activities focused on supporting the project's WUF presence, and that other activities took place in parallel, rather than being integrated with the work of local project teams.

Linkages within McGill involving the School of Environment and the Faculty of Agriculture did not materialize. In the first case, the School of Environment was disbanded – at least temporarily - during the life of the project, reasons cited for the lack of institutional connection with the Faculty of Agriculture include the physical distance separating the two programs (the Faculty of Agriculture is located on the western end of the island of Montreal), and the absence of a formal arrangement needed to coordinate the participation of a member of a different Faculty. Nevertheless, these linkages were thought to have had positive potential, and to be worth pursuing in future projects.

Decreased reliance on the ISS and increased focus on more traditional communication mechanisms including phone, email, mail, and site visits was thought to be a key

improvement in the area of project coordination. In particular, use of outcome journals was cited as a successful reporting format. The coordinating team's assumption of responsibility with respect to facilitating South-South communication and knowledge transfer was also a useful shift.

On the whole, however, team members pointed to a lack of resources allocated to basic project management activities. This was likely exacerbated by the demands on project administration resources due to the broad scope of the project and lack of focus evident during its first half. Team members felt that insufficient resources were allocated to administrative tasks such as reporting and accounting, with the associated workload having been underestimated at project planning stages. This was true both at the project coordination level, and with respect to the administrative capacities of local teams, particularly those without interns.

Team members also described a lack of resources for site visits and face-to-face interaction with local project teams. Coordinators thought that increased travel to project sites would have especially helpful in the area of training and capacity-building, and earlier implementation of risk assessment and mitigation strategies. For instance, the emergence in Colombo of key partners (the Chief Medical Officer of Health and the department of Ayurvedic medicine) did not occur until late in the project, when a site visit was made by members of the coordinating team.

Many of these difficulties can be linked to the failure to maximize the usefulness of the project logframe. Consistent application of this tool would have enabled project coordinators to refocus priorities, undertake strategic allocation of resources, prevent 'scope creep', identify and mitigate risks, and facilitate clear systems of reporting and accountability among local partner teams. In general project team members report feeling there was too much 'remote control', and that a more active, structured, face-to-face, and 'hands on' approach to coordination was needed.

Summary Table of Recommendations

#	Mid-Term Evaluation Recommendation	Progress Since July 2005
	3.1 Strengthening the Project Results Framework	
1	Using table 1 as a guide, design a project results framework, with explicit reference to project activities, outputs, outcomes, impact, reach and risk.	A project results framework was revised at the May 2005 internal workshop. While this was thought to be helpful, it is not clear that the revised logframe was fully developed or adequately used to guide project decision-making and accountability. For example, 'reach' and 'risk' are not identified.
2	Identify measurable indicators for each of the key outcomes anticipated during the life of the project, with the number of these outcomes to be scaled back.	Indicators are not defined in a way that is measurable or observable. However, a number of project documents provide examples of specific indicators of change, illustrating how this component could have been developed by the coordinating team.
3	Report on progress towards intended outcomes and impact, and report on expected versus actual outputs.	A system of regular Outcome Journals was implemented, resulting in more regular reporting of progress towards results, and early identification of risks. Regular communication was bolstered by more frequent phone calls and site visits. Willingness on the part of local teams to openly report 'risk' in this transparent and direct format was thought to be an important success.
	3.2 Organizational Behavioural Change	
4	Develop indicators for monitoring and evaluating behavioural changes in selected project partners.	More attention was given to indicator development during the second half of the project. However, indicators were not adequately developed, referring to changes in "attitude, vision, and capacity" without specifying how these changes could be observed or measured. Measurable and observable illustrations of change are provided in various project documents, however, these do not appear to have identified as targets up-front, and therefore are not explicitly laid out in the project logframe.
5	Identify those organizations most critical to achieving project results in each of the three cities.	Project team members effectively identified key organizations in each project jurisdiction. However in Colombo, two new organizational stakeholders (the departments of Public Health and Ayurvedic medicine) emerged late in the process. It is difficult to say whether earlier attention to organizational behavioural change would have resulted in the earlier identification and involvement of these key partners.

6	Rather than major changes to local business models for development, clearly define the "marginal gains" to be achieved in each city.	During the second half of the project, all team members appeared to recognize the need to identify more realistic expectations given project timing and resource limitations. An 'incremental', 'demonstration / pilot' or 'marginal gains' approach was adopted by local project teams, but it is not clear that this strategic shift was explicitly directed or managed by the coordinating team.
	3.3 Participatory Site Design and Planning	
7	Explicit reference to a participatory design-based planning process should be inserted into the Colombo Workplan.	More explicit reference to participatory community design in Colombo was initially addressed via work with local NGO Sevanatha; however, meaningful participatory UA design was not implemented to the satisfaction of the coordination team (likely due to a lack of capacity on the part of the NGO). Subsequently, uptake of participatory community design occurred more successfully through the Departments of Public Health and Ayurvedic Medicine, where practice has shifted from dispensing medicinal plants to significant community involvement and capacity-building.
8	Site design in Kampala should involve key decision-makers, rather than prospective residents.	During the second half of the project, documentation reflects attention to the need to involve key institutional decision-makers in Kampala; emphasis was placed on targeting the mayor and members of city council to ensure high level buy-in. This has proved important given current political threats to the poor-poor focus of the project.
	3.4 Multi-stakeholder Team Approach	
	No recommendations	
	3.5 Training and Knowledge Transfer	
9	The target audience for training and knowledge activities must be more carefully defined in terms of individuals or organizations whose behaviour is to be influenced by the project.	Local target organizations for behavioural change were effectively identified during the second half of the project. However, clear definition of this audience did not translate into the production of targeted knowledge transfer materials. There was significant focus on WUF outputs for an international audience. Other key audiences do not appear to be explicitly defined and linked to knowledge transfer activities. Nonetheless, important learning is captured in high-quality draft materials that could be developed beyond the life of the project.
10	Build in more face-to-face interaction between	From the perspective of the project team, involvement of local and

	international trainers and local City Teams.	international technical personnel was felt to be generally accounted-for in project activities. However, insufficient knowledge transfer was attributed to the fact that professional and technical outputs (including student contributions), and travel resources were oriented to WUF rather than to local training, capacity-building, and implementation.
11	Make available a wider diversity of disciplines, including agricultural sciences.	This was not perceived to be a key challenge (see above).
12	Where demand warrants, international design experts should be inserted into the local participatory design process.	Further involvement of international design experts was not perceived to be necessary. However, the local participatory design process was thought to need strengthening in general vis a vis WUF related outputs (see above).
13	Remaining student-related project outputs should be carefully reviewed to determine their contribution to core project results.	Student outputs were focused on production of WUF materials including the pavilion and panel formats. This was thought to be very successful in terms of a high-quality presence at the WUF. However, this occurred at the cost of using student resources to strengthen local design processes, potentially resulting in missed opportunities for student learning and academic research in the area of participatory local UA design.
14	Consider the production of a participatory design handbook with a UA focus.	High quality draft materials were produced. However, emphasis on production of WUF materials prevented published versions of these being completed during the life of the project.
15	Make available to City Teams relevant hard copy publications and print media from Canada and international sources.	Effective distribution of relevant material by traditional means was undertaken by the coordinating team; lack of access to such publications was not seen to be a significant barrier. However, suggestions that this function could be strengthened via use of a website, bulletin board, or blog did not appear to be implemented.
	3.6 Resource Expansion (RX) Strategy	
16	Project implementation should be shifted to a long-term project impact, rather than an outcome to be achieved during the life of the project.	Expected implementation results were scaled back to be more in-line with project resources and timing. However, it was not clear whether this was strategically managed by the coordinating team, or explicitly outlined in the project logframe.
17	Formally shift the role of the Coordination Team from RX leader to RX enabler.	IDRC assumed more responsibility for the project RX strategy, hiring consultants who would assist with identification of potential implementation partners. This was thought to be helpful in terms of freeing up the coordinating team to focus on implementation. However, the activities of the

		consultants were thought to be insufficiently integrated with local project activities and associated RX activities.
18	Identify a local "developer" in each city who champions the project and is able to take on multiple dimensions of project implementation.	This recommendation was not explicitly implemented. However, members of the coordinating team suggest that there was a need for more capacity building of local teams with respect to RX. A number of potential RX opportunities were not able to be sufficiently developed and/or leveraged.
19	Revisit the role of the Advisory Board and consider its dissolution.	This entity never materialized, and there is not clear consensus as to the perceived usefulness of such a structure. However, some members of the coordinating team suggested that some form of senior advisory input would have been helpful in several areas, particularly in the area of RX capacity-building and RX 'connectors'.
	3.7 Knowledge Management and the Project ISS	
20	Scale down the level of investment in the ISS to more closely reflect the planned outputs identified at the proposal stage.	This was accomplished.
21	Make better use of medium-tech solutions such as the mcgill.ca/mchg website and CDs/DVDs couriered between Montreal and the three partner cities.	Communication effectively settled into more conventional means. However, preparation of WUF materials was undertaken online which speaks to the potential usefulness of hi-tech mediums if used in conjunction with other effective forms of project management, communication, and coordination. It is not clear to what extent use of a project website was maximized.
22	Make available broader and simpler information-sharing guidelines and protocols.	Information-sharing occurred more smoothly during the second half of the project via the use of regular Outcome Journals, and other more conventional means. In particular, the use of protocols and guides used to facilitate production of WUF materials was thought to be a replicable tool.
	3.8 South-South Knowledge Transfer	
23	The Project Coordination Team's role should be to collect, process, synthesize, translate and disseminate information that is of interest to the different teams.	The coordination team effectively took a more active role in sharing information among local teams (see above).
24	Consider using the WUF as a forum for face-to-face interaction among team members.	This was done and was helpful. However, it did not necessarily result in increased South-South interaction during the remainder of the project.
	3.9 Documenting and Disseminating research	

	findings and results	
25	More explicit emphasis is needed on the preparation of local marketing and promotional materials to be used to secure support for project implementation within each city.	Efforts in this area include the production of a video by the Rosario team as well as production of leaflets in Colombo and Kampala, and a booklet in Colombo. However, it is not clear whether these activities were adequately emphasized and linked with implementation strategies.
26	Urgent action is needed to fully engage the three City Teams in a joint proposal for participation in the WUF.	This was implemented very successfully, but to the detriment of other project activities. Resourcing arrangements related to event preparation will need to be revisited for similar undertakings in the future.
27	Consider using the WUF to present earlier and ongoing UA projects in each of the three cities.	This was implemented successfully (see above). A number of project documents offer useful evaluation of project sessions and pavilion content that could inform future dissemination and promotion efforts.
28	Guidelines and protocols for relying on multi-media technologies should be simplified and allowed to be tailored to local circumstances.	This was effectively addressed during the second half of the project (see above).
29	Non-WUF outputs related to international networking and publishing should be excluded from the core project results framework.	This recommendation was met through a clear focus on WUF-outputs. Nonetheless, project team members also participated at the 74th ACFAS conference, which was thought to be an important deliverable in terms of contribution to scholarly forums.
	3.10 Coordination Team Roles and Responsibilities	
30	Consider several modifications to the terms of reference for members of the Project Coordination Team.	A number of modifications were made (eg. shift in efforts allocated to the ISS and the RX strategy). These were thought to be helpful. However, it was also felt that sufficient resources had not been allocated to project coordination, administrative, reporting and accounting functions. In general coordination team members reported feeling there was too much 'remote control', and that a more active, structured, face-to-face and 'hands on' approach to coordination would have been helpful.

4. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This section presents lessons learned for IDRC's Urban Poverty & Environment Program (UPE) in relation to future programming in the area of Urban Agriculture, and in relation to any future partnership with the Minimum Cost Housing Group (MCHG). The conclusions and recommendations identified in this section ask what UPE could have done differently, and focus on the strengths and value-added of the MCHG.

The Overall Conclusion: All roads lead back to the need for a clear, concise, and measurable project results framework.

While the EL project appears to have delivered a wide range of development results, it also suffered from two significant difficulties: a very limited amount of reporting available to be reviewed by third parties (including the evaluator), and the absence of a logical framework from which to understand the achievement of project results.

A results framework – even if it is simple – serves as an essential guide to effective and efficient project management. The logical framework (logframe), and the indicators used to measure and monitor progress towards results, need not be complex. When done well, the framework and accompanying indicators provide objective and transparent guidance for priority setting for all project team members, and allow for monitoring of measurable progress towards achievement of key milestones.

A reliable results framework also contributes to more mechanical, and less controversial, reporting on and evaluation of project results. Results frameworks are also useful for defining and marketing to selected audiences (project reach), and enabling the project team to anticipate predictable but manageable potential threats or obstacles (project risks). Where a project is seeking to influence organizational or individual behaviour, it is vitally important to establish clear distinctions between target audiences.

In the absence of a clear logical framework, the principal challenge facing the project is the difficulty of anticipating trade-offs in project priorities and managing project resource allocation. In effect, the major limitation of the project has been the lack of management coherence and the tendency to shift resources in an unplanned and unexpected fashion. This resulted in a gap between the expectations among the management team members and between local city teams and project management. Even in the easiest of circumstances (all team members speaking the same language, working in the same physical space), there will necessarily be confusion and resentment over changes to project direction and resource allocation if a clearly laid out, defensible project management plan is not put in place with the consent of all involved. In effect, the project management plan is the equivalent of a contract between all parties. In the absence of a contract, there is a strong likelihood of misunderstanding and erosion of good faith.

The EL project enjoyed limited effectiveness in knowledge transfer via locally relevant knowledge products and South-South communication.

While there was considerable interest in using project resources to invest in knowledge products such as methodology guides and technical toolkits, these generally were not carried out, or were not completed. However, these types of products must be carefully designed and disseminated to reach the appropriate audience and have a desired effect.

For example, the ability of a tool-kit to achieve a particular development result is far from definitive.

Similarly, face-to-face interaction among project participants and between technical experts and participants is an invaluable form of knowledge sharing. It is also very expensive, and, if not structured carefully can fail to deliver results.

In the end, what is important is to clearly define the desired results associated with knowledge transfer and to focus efforts on designing a process and products consistent with these results. In the absence of a carefully defined project results framework, there is a real danger that knowledge products are prepared with inadequate resources, delivered at inappropriate times, and fail to reach the appropriate target audience.

A clear and unexpected MCHG value-added was in the areas of technological innovation and policy promotion.

While the process was not elegant, one outcome of the project was an interesting and dynamic emphasis on two areas of relevance to IDRC and UPE. To have been successful, the focus on these two areas would have required explicit project planning, and managed resource allocation. In the case of the use of new technologies, there would have been a need to establish a project network of tech-friendly people, from both the end-user and provider perspectives. In the case of the WUF, more accurate budget planning for the full cost of a project presence would have been essential, including numbers of sessions, displays, participants, and full travel costs.

- advancing innovation in knowledge management

This first area represents a potentially powerful mechanism for reporting on a diversity of activities taking place globally and then sharing these in a highly cost-effective manner. The successful use of web-based tools and capturing and uploading/downloading digital content could provide a tremendous value-added to any project with a global reach. The reality is that the EL project was not designed to accomplish this type of activity, and the level of investment in this component was not justified. However, had the project been designed and resourced with this objective in mind, the outcome could have been far more beneficial.

- strategically promoting a policy message to a global audience

A clear project strength was the ability of the team to effectively define, promote and market the UA message. The team made excellent use of media, public events, and high-visibility communications products. Achieving results in this second area is critical for long-term achievement of on-the-ground results in the area of UA. Building the credibility of UA as a development priority, and contributing to clearer understanding of how UA relates closely to other development goals is vital. The resulting up-take by international donor agencies, national governments or private sector investors would, in turn, contribute to tremendous advancements in the field of UA. However, it is also important that the relationship between promotion/communications and up-take by global and local players is measured and monitored.

Two additional MCHG assets could be better leveraged in the future: student input and participatory site design talent.

One of the key strengths of the project coordination team was the capacity to leverage student input. Student contributions were instrumental in a number of areas including the preparation of project documentation at several points and, specifically, high quality WUF pavilion materials. Scope exists for more formalized and structured student input.

Similarly, participatory site design is clearly a MCHG comparative advantage. However, its application at the local level was not always evident.

The project would have benefited from a formalized recruitment process and clearer mandate for the Canadian Project Manager.

The MCHG has a well-established and well-deserved reputation for delivering numerous projects, of varying complexity, over many years. At the same time, the suggestion has been made that the project manager was relatively inexperienced. While the evaluator's terms of reference did not include a review of team member resumes, there is no evidence of a recruitment process having been put in place to select the project manager. Nor were clear terms of reference evident for the project manager position. In this case, the project would have benefited from the combination of a well-established organization and an experienced project manager.

In particular, the project manager must have a demonstrated comfort level with results-based programming and reporting. The emphasis is not on micro-managed control of local projects, but on the ability to clearly communicate priorities to local teams, work with local teams to enable flow of communication back to IDRC, and to put in place an effective incentives/disincentives structure for delivering on these priorities and communications. Also important is the ability to manage expectations among project participants, anticipate and address real risks, and communicate effectively with the right people at the right time

The project was disadvantaged by a blurring of responsibilities involving project management and technological innovation.

The EL project suffered from competition between the delivery of basic "bread and butter" project management responsibilities and the desire to champion experimentation with innovative tools and technologies. While both objectives are worthy, there are risks associated with having both delivered by the same individual. Unfortunately, there is an inherent conflict of interest in trying to achieve both these objectives. In this particular case, the project manager should not have also been the key advocate for innovations not central to achieving project results.

Had resources been available, or had the coordination structure been designed differently, the separation of these responsibilities may well have benefited the project.

A "lighter touch" and decentralized approach to project management would be beneficial in a multi-city project.

Project management involving diverse city teams spread around the world should require relatively little day-to-day control from the centre. A less intensive and more

decentralized approach would make it possible to manage a mix of city teams with an infinite array of geographic, cultural, developmental and linguistic diversity.

An experienced project manager would work with counterpart local coordinators in each city, who would, in turn, be responsible for two-way communications and reporting. Interns or young professionals in each site could be extremely valuable in this regard. During the EL project, their role included structuring and documenting local activities, ensuring momentum, and smoothing and maintaining communication between the local and coordinating teams.

A decentralized project management structure would rely heavily on a broad framework for results-based programming, with a common set of indicators. These tools would be essential to providing guidance for local city teams. Funds would be disbursed locally based on the ability of local teams to report successfully on having delivered on results.

The project would have benefited from IDRC/UPE providing clear guidance on intended results.

The UPE has a role to play in clearly articulating its own priorities, its desired reach, and identifying typical risks and risk management strategies. The UPE can also translate this broad results framework into a measurable set of indicators. These indicators can be simple and broad in scope, providing a framework for more refined indicators prepared by project teams.

For example, what was not clear is IDRC/UPE's intended return on its project investment. How do they wish to measure it? Development impact? Visibility of impact? Impact in Canada? Visibility of project?

The subject of research is an important one in this context. IDRC's mandate has traditionally been to support research and build research capacity in developing countries. However, the EL project was very much about "action" and demonstrating concepts rather than contributing to the body of scholarly research, or to building research capacity. It is not clear if this was an intentional direction, or one that evolved with the project. For future reference, the research mandate of UA projects should be clarified.

The RX Function should be dropped. IDRC/UPE should do what it does best: designing and managing high-quality research and research capacity building projects with carefully selected partners around the world.

There is a long history at IDRC of seeking to combine good research with good entrepreneurship. However, this combination has always been a tough nut to crack. There are often two distinct and generally incompatible RX objectives at play: On the one hand, researchers have a natural incentive in place to secure additional research funds. However, this function should be separated from IDRC-funded project activities.

A separate objective is to secure funds needed to implement projects arising from research activities. This function is terribly challenging, requiring very specialized skill sets, lobbying capability, and substantial luck in terms of timing. In general, IDRC/UPE's role is likely best left to delivering high quality research projects and research capacity

building projects. The only indirect contribution to RX would be to ensure that the right audience is fully aware of these achievements.

IDRC/UPE should review the apparent competition for scarce resources between the EL project and the Focus City project.

While a specific analysis of the impact of the Focus City project on the EL project was beyond the scope of the evaluation, EL team members expressed the frustration that the net effect of this new IDRC-funded project was to drain valuable resources from the EL project. This took the form of team members shifting their time to Focus City proposal preparation and project delivery. This was an unintended outcome. For their part, IDRC's concern is that the organizations which chose to prepare an FC proposal did not properly account for the time needed to both pursue a new project and fulfill their obligations related to the EL project.

With results frameworks clearly defined, IDRC/UPE could rely on in-house evaluation & monitoring.

The mid-term evaluation was an important exercise to help guide the project team. The exercise would have benefited from a clearly articulated set of objectives, intended outcomes, and performance indicators. In fact, a clearer results framework would have made it more feasible to rely on the IDRC's in-house staff to conduct this activity. The role of an external consultant could be more narrowly targeted towards assistance with preparing an adaptable results framework in advance of project activities.

Explore a Global Secretariat for UA based on the principles of this evaluation report.

The findings and conclusions of the evaluation suggest a Canadian-based global secretariat for UA focused on communications, promotion, visibility and decentralized project coordination. Local activities would be delivered using a simple, but clearly defined logical framework with measurable indicators of success adapted to a local context. Development and adaptation of relevant communication and technologies would be an integral aspect of this secretariat. In fact, a secretariat model was supported by IDRC in the mid-1990s in the form of the Support Group on Urban Agriculture (SGUA). However, the SGUA did not prove financially or institutionally sustainable.

MCHG recently submitted a proposal to SSHRC to host what would effectively serve as an international research secretariat for the promotion of UA. The proposal was submitted with several partners including IDRC. In light of IDRC's prior experience with a global secretariat model, a review of lessons learned from this experience would be beneficial should the MCHG application be successful.

ANNEXES

1. List of Acronyms
2. Final Evaluation Interview Questions
3. List of people interviewed
4. Bibliography
5. McGill at the World Urban Forum
6. Biography of Evaluator
7. ToRs for Evaluator

Annex 1 List of Acronyms

ACFAS – Association canadienne-française pour l'avancement des sciences
ACR – Acacia Consulting & Research
CEPAR - Centro de Estudios de Producciones Agroecologicas
CDC – Community Development Committee
EL - Edible Landscape
FC – Focus City
FTP – File Transfer Protocol
IDRC - International Development Research Centre
ISS-   Information Sharing System
KCC- Kampala City Council
MCHG- McGill University Minimum Cost Housing Group
MDG – Millennium Development Goal
RX- Resource Expansion
SGUA - Support Group for Urban Agriculture
UA – Urban Agriculture
WUF – World Urban Forum

Annex 2 Final Evaluation Interview Questions

The following questions relate predominately to major issues and recommendations identified via the Project Mid-Term Evaluation; feedback will be used to inform future IDRC projects.

Strengthening the Project Results Framework
1. To what extent was the REVISED logframe useful during the project?
2. In developing and implementing the results framework, what would have helped – templates / formats / strategy for dissemination?
3. What would have been the most effective point intervention for introducing performance measures to the project?
4. Describe the most significant impact of the project on integrating or reinforcing the practice of UA into each of the three partner cities.

Organizational Behavioural Change
5. Can you identify a concrete example of organizational change from each of the three cities? How does this suggest a way of measuring organizational behavioural change in the future?
6. Please outline how the team understood the concept of measuring 'marginal gains'? What are the 'lessons learned' in this area?

Participatory Site Design and Planning
▪ No further questions

Multi-stakeholder Team Approach
7. One project team member suggested that 'project field representatives' (eg. Kampala interns or local hires) have played key roles. Who served as project field representatives in each of the cities? How could this function have been strengthened?

Training and Knowledge Transfer
8. Project documents reflect a sense of 'trade-off' between focus of time and energy on WUF outcomes verses accomplishment of on-the-ground results. In hindsight – (how) would you have handled the 'trade-off' differently?
9. In retrospect, what kinds of knowledge products would have been most usefully transferred? and to whom? (City Teams, Other researchers, Other prospective partners)
10. What form of knowledge transfer proved most effective in terms of equipping local teams with new skills or tools or ideas? How much did this vary from city to city?
11. What forms of knowledge transfer proved least effective?

Resource Expansion Strategy
12. Was the Team able to use the FC projects to reinforce the EL project in Colombo and Kampala?
13. What was the impact of shifting RX function from McGill to IDRC? Did it go 'too far'? Did it have the desired effect of allowing the team to focus on core results?
14. Could you provide some retrospective thoughts regarding an Advisory Board: Could there have been a way of establishing one? How could it have played an effective role?

Knowledge Management & the Project ISS
15. What was the extent of web-based project documentation? [Please provide url.]
16. Are there City Team reports on 'results accomplished' that we can review?
17. What were the 'lessons learned' in this area?

South-South Knowledge Transfer
▪ No further questions

Documenting and Disseminating Research Findings and Results
18. This project had a focus on 'action' rather than academic research: demonstration and implementation of UA concepts. In hindsight, was this favourable? Would you suggest a different 'research-action' balance?

Coordination Team Roles and Responsibilities
19. The three city teams were very diverse in terms of language, geography, level of development and sophistication in UA and design. In retrospect, would McGill-ETC have picked a more similar set of cities to work with? What are the benefits and disadvantages of this approach?
20. Would McGill-ETC have designed the communications system among partners any differently?

Annex 3 List of People Interviewed and Meetings Attended

World Urban Forum Activities and Interviews

Tuesday, June 20, 2006
1:30-3:30pm: WUF Networking Session: Growing better cities: create jobs, protect the environment, and enhance food security
2:15pm Students: Lorena
2:30pm: Rune Kongshaug
4:15pm: Marielle Dubelling

Wednesday, June 21, 2006
EL Networking Session 1:30-3:30pm: Partnering with the poor: Leveraging Land for Change
4:30pm: Vikram Bhatt

Thurs June 22, 2006
10:45am – Review of Pavilion Documentation: Rosario Display, Colombo Display, Kampala Display
City of Montreal – Morning Workshop

Post-World Urban Forum Interview schedule

Thurs Jan 18, 2007
11:00am: Vikram Bhatt

Friday Jan 19, 2007
12:30pm: Rune Kongshaug

Wednesday Jan 24, 2007
9:00am: Marielle Dubelling

Mid-Term Evaluation Interviews

Interview/Meeting	Date
Mark Redwood, Andres Guerra – Inception Meeting	2:00pm Wednesday, May 11, 2005
Jeanne Wolfe and Vikram Bhatt – Meeting	1:00pm Tuesday, May 17
McGill MCHG Students – Meeting	3:00pm Tuesday, May 17
McGill Workshop Events	Wednesday, May 18
McGill Workshop Roundtable Discussion	Monday, May 23
Marielle Dubelling – Interview	11:30 am Monday, May 23
N. S. Jayasundera, Colombo Team Leader – Interview	1:00 pm Monday, May 23
Teleconference with Kampala Team	1:30pm Monday, May 23
Sri Lankan Presentation	1:45pm Monday, May 23
Mark Redwood – Meeting	12:30pm Wednesday July 6
Jeanne Wolfe – Telephone Interview	9:00am Thursday, July 14
Rosario City Team Members – Field Interview	1:00pm Friday, July 15

Annex 4 McGill's participation at the World Urban Forum III
Vancouver, BC, June 19-23, 2006

Background: The Executive of the UN HABITAT meets every two years to set its goals and policy directions; during the intervening alternate years, to keep the Secretariat informed of problems, prospects, policy options, current thinking and ongoing research related to the built environment the World Urban Forums (WUF) are held. The WUF I was held in Istanbul, WUF II in Barcelona and the latest World Urban Forum III was recently hosted by Canada in Vancouver, BC from June 19-23, 2006.

The selection of Vancouver was significant as it coincided with the 30th anniversary of the UN HABITAT itself, which was born as a result of the Habitat I Conference that was held in Vancouver in 1976. The 1976 Habitat I Conference recognized that the human habitat was an important dimension of the human development and underscored that professionals, researchers, NGOs and governments had important roles to play in it, particularly by placing "local community concerns on the international agenda and highlighted the critical importance of inclusiveness." Compared to 1976 Habitat I the WUF III was a mega event. With some 11,000 participants from over 100 countries, the Third Session of the World Urban Forum was one of the most widely attended.

WUF III: According to a UN estimate, in 1950, only one-third of the world's population lived in cities. Just 50 years later, this rose to one-half and will continue to grow to two-thirds, or 6 billion people, by 2050. Cities are now home to half the humanity, how to make them safe, sustainable, livable and inclusive is a global challenge. It was in this context that the UN HABITAT had chosen *"Ideas into Action"* as the theme of the Forum; "[T]he quest for innovative ideas and practical solutions – rare for a meeting convened by the United Nations."

This jam packed event was very well organized: it was divided in two main areas: Exhibition and Conference. There were close to 200 exhibitors and the conference side had "six Dialogues, 13 Roundtables and more than 160 Networking Events. Ministers, mayors, academics, community-based organizations, federations of non-governmental organizations, and the private sector shared their insights and experiences on what would improve the quality of life in the world's growing cities. The inclusive approach followed at the Forum is a model for cities. Some are already following this model while others would benefit from doing so. It was promising that participants, in such large numbers and from all walks of society, began to converge towards an outline for the way forward."

McGill at WUF III: McGill's Minimum Cost Housing Group had the largest Quebec presence - exhibit - at the Forum (other Quebec reps included: the Province of Quebec, SHQ, the city of Montreal, and so on). We showcased our "Making the Edible Landscape" Project, a three-year collaborative project to demonstrate the value of including productive planting – urban agriculture - as a permanent feature in city planning and housing design. This was done in both sides of the Forum, namely, the Exhibition and in the Conference in which we ran a very successful networking Event. The Minimum Cost Housing Group of McGill University (in partnership with Schools of Environment and Planning), and Resource Center for Urban Agriculture and Food Security (RUAF) are coordinating research in one Northern and three Southern cities: Montreal, Canada; Colombo, Sri Lanka; Kampala, Uganda; and Rosario. The project is

financed by IDRC and the Urban Management Program of the United Nations Human Settlements Program (UN-HABITAT).

Modern cities are seen as centers of food consumption and rural areas as places of production, and therefore, designers and planners tend to create city landscapes for beauty, not utility. But many kinds of urban agriculture already exist around the world from balcony gardens to poultry farms. The objective of our current research project is to formalize this activity thru design. In each of the Southern sites, city officials, architects, and urban planners form a collaborative team, working closely with local communities. Various housing designs, ranging from urban upgrading of slums to a brand-new low-income housing neighborhood, that include food-producing gardens to demonstrate the potential of urban agriculture were proposed, and are now being implemented. In addition, the team has already documented and published the workings of Montreal's successful community gardens program and is now exploring ways to use productive planting in urban renewal.

To showcase the Making the Edible Landscape at WUF III a team of graduate students from McGill's Minimum Cost Housing program not only designed, but also built the display pavilion on the exhibition floor. The exhibit highlighted different ways of combining living, working, and growing food within the city. As the world's population becomes increasingly urban, cities everywhere – North as well as the South - face a mounting challenge of ensuring clean water, sanitation, and food security for their people. The results of this ambitious project thus addressed the United Nations Millennium Development goals of improving housing, income, and food security for the poor.

McGill team had built one of the most effective exhibition pavilions that attracted a very large number of visitors, including, Ms. Vivian Manasc, President of the Royal Architectural Institute of Canada (who has shown interest in sending our exhibit across Canada); Dr. Maureen O'Neill, President, International Development Research Center; Mayor of Montreal Hon. Gerald Tremblay; former mayors of Colombo, Gunwardhana and of Kampala, Ssebaana Kizito; Hon. Nathalie Normandeau, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Regions, Government of Quebec; Hon. Dinesh, Minister of Urban Development, Sri Lanka. It is important to note that all these were lengthy visits and each one of them spent between half to full hour looking at our display and interacting with our team members. The theme of Urban Agriculture and of Edible Landscape raised tremendous interest from Forum participants as well as the media. Leading up to the Forum, The Ottawa Citizen, the Globe and Mail and the Montreal Gazette all ran stories about our project. During the WUF III, also there was wide coverage given to our work by both by the printed media as well as radio and TV, including the most watched CBC National News.

Annex 5 Bibliography

Bhatt, Vikram and Rune Kongshaug (eds). 2005. EL1 Making the Edible Landscape. A Study of Urban Agriculture in Montreal. McGill University Minimum Cost Housing Group.

Colombo Mission I Report. Visit dates October 21 to 30 2004. Team Marielle Dubbeling and Vikram Bhatt

Edible Landscape Tools: Minimum Cost Housing Group. McGill University. Winter Semester 2005. www.mcgill.ca/mchg

Kampala Report. Marielle Dubbeling. Jeanne Wolfe. 3-9 October, 2004.

Kampala. Workshop on Participatory Design. For a site in the Walufumbe Zone of Kyanja Parish. 25 – 27 January 2005

Making the Edible Landscape / UMP-McGill Participatory Planning, Design and Development of Garden Neighbourhoods. July 1 – December 31, 2004 Project Report. www.mcgill.ca/mchg/projects/edible

Making the Edible Landscape Project. Halgaha Kumbura – Colombo. Work Plan - June 2005 - December 2006

Making the Edible Landscape. Planning and Design for Urban Agriculture. Project for 2004-2006. Proposal. McGill-UMP Grant Application. May 10, 2004.

Making the Edible Landscape. Second Technical Report: Jan 1 – Jun 30, 2005

Mark Redwood. February 12, 2005. IDRC Comments on the First Technical Progress Report.

Mark Redwood. IDRC Comments on Second Progress Report. July 12, 2005

Mark Redwood. Montreal. May 17th to May 23, 2005. Mid-Term Workshop at McGill University

Mark Redwood. Participatory Planning, Design and Development of Garden Neighbourhoods. Project Monitoring Report. Confidential. Sept 22, 2004.

Mark Redwood. Trip Report. McGill University - Montreal, Quebec. December 7th, 2004

Mark Redwood. Trip/Monitoring Report. McGill University, School of Architecture - Montreal, Quebec. February 28, 2005

MCHG and ETC. August 25, 2004. Design for Urban Agriculture. IDRC Annual Conference. Cities Feeding People. Toronto.

Project Completion Report - Project Number 100983 - Optimizing use of vacant land for Urban Agriculture (UA) through participatory planning processes. Sept 2001- Dec 2003

Rosario Report. Site visit and until current date. Marielle Dubelling. Rune Kongshaug. 19-29 September, 2004. Today's date: Thursday, November 4, 2004

School of Urban Planning – McGill University. Making the Edible Landscape
Planning and Design for Urban Agriculture. Planning for Comprehensive
Urban Agriculture: Linking Actors and Information. Final Report March 2005

Supplement to IDRC Report for Q3 and Q4 (July 1-December 31, 2004).

The EL Tool - http://www.el.mcgill.ca/

Annex 6 Biography of the Evaluator

Acacia Consulting & Research (acaciaconsulting.ca) is an Ottawa-based company established in 1999 to help urban, municipal and community-based organizations make better use of data, information and knowledge in order to influence policy and effect change at the local and neighbourhood levels.

Michel Frojmovic has practiced in Canada, the Caribbean, Latin America, Eastern Europe and Asia since 1993 as an urban policy and local governance specialist. His project experience has focused on inter-disciplinary, municipal-community-private partnership approaches to addressing local governance, social development, housing and environmental issues. His experience has been applied to project management, evaluation & monitoring, multi-stakeholder process management, policy and strategy formulation, institutional analysis & organizational development, survey and qualitative research, and training manual design. Over the past six years, Michel has taken on an active role in neighbourhood development issues in Ottawa. In 2004, he founded Creative Neighbourhoods, a non-profit organization dedicated to strengthening neighbourhood identity and diversity. Michel holds a Master of Urban Planning and Bachelor of Arts (Honours Political Science) from McGill University, and is a full member of the Canadian Institute of Planners.

Annex 7 Draft Terms of Reference
Urban Poverty and Environment (UPE), IDRC

Evaluation of Project: UMP-McGill: Participatory Planning, Design and Development of
Garden Neighbourhoods

General Objective of Evaluation
The main objective of this evaluation is to strengthen the research project by analysing
the relevance and adequacy of the project's research themes, project management and
methodology, and providing recommendations that will feed back into the activities
carried out by the research teams.

Evaluation Users and Use
The primary rational for the evaluation is as a learning input for both the project
coordination team and the Urban Poverty and the Environment (UPE) team.

The evaluation is intended to inform future IDRC programming, strengthen the project's
research content and findings, and increase knowledge on project design and
implementation. Research partners will also benefit from using the evaluation
recommendations to strengthen the current project as well as future projects.

As the evaluation will take place in two steps (May, 2005 - McGill workshop and June,
2006 - WUF) it is both a **formative** evaluation that contributes to the ongoing project, as
well as providing **summative analysis** of its results and lessons.

Specific Objectives
1. Determine if the research issues (community planning and design) satisfactorily
    address the main problems facing the integration of UA into official urban
    planning and design in developing countries contributing to the achievement the
    project's objectives
2. Evaluate the project methodology and interaction between all participants
    involved in the project.

Methodology of Evaluation

Task 1:
Background
Research
	• Study the project's documentation
	  ○ Research proposal, work plan, project appraisal
	     document, technical and financial reports, etc.

Task 2
Data gathering:
Interviews
	• Obtain additional project information as required
	• Interviews should be conducted with, but not limited to:
	  ○ Project leader
	  ○ Project coordinator
	  ○ McGill students
	  ○ City teams
	  ○ Responsible IDRC staff

Task 3 Data gathering at McGill Workshop (May 18th to May 25th)	• Participate in the project's workshop at McGill University in order to gather information from the different participants on the key issues addressed by the research project. • Interview selected city partners - on an individual and group basis
Task 4 Submit an evaluation Progress Report	• Write and submit to IDRC a Formative evaluation report (mid-term), no later than a month following the McGill workshop (limit to 20 pages without annexes)
Task 5 Attend the World Urban Forum III (WUF III)	• Participate in the WUF III (Vancouver, June 2006) in order to evaluate project results and impacts • Interview project partners to increase evaluation analysis' insights.
Task 6 Submit a final evaluation report	• Submit a final report no latter than 2 months following WUF III and that does not exceed 25 pages without annexes. The final report should include the following sections: • Guidelines for formatting IDRC evaluation reports will be sent to the Evaluator

Outputs
The following are the main evaluation outputs:

Product	Due Date
A mid-term formative evaluation report will highlight strategic feedback on the research project and present suggestions	June 30th, 2005
Organize a meeting with the Project Coordination team to discuss evaluation results and next steps (in Ottawa or Montreal).	By mid-July, 2005
A final Evaluation Report that will present results and discuss lessons-learned from the project to inform future IDRC project design.	August 30th, 2006